

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. XLVIII, No. 26
WHOLE No. 1227

April 1, 1933

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGES
CHRONICLE	609-612
EDITORIALS	
War Clouds in Europe—Total Abstinence at Notre Dame—Lobbies at Washington—Labor Unions and the Law—How About Mexico?—Holy Year Inaugural.....	613-615
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Einstein and Galileo—An Open Letter to Ambassador Daniels—Inside the Roman Collar—Distractions and Reality in Russia.....	616-623
ECONOMICS	
Leverage and Profits.....	623-625
EDUCATION	
A Finance Plan for Parish Schools.....	625-626
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF.....	626-627
BACK OF BUSINESS.....	628
LITERATURE	
To Janice and Several Young Artists.....	628-629
REVIEWS	629-632
COMMUNICATIONS	632

Chronicle

Home News.—The Senate and House conferees reached an agreement on the Cullen beer bill on March 20, so that a 3.2-per-cent alcoholic content will be permitted, instead of 3.05 per cent as voted by the Senate, with no restriction on the sale to minors. On March 22 the President signed the bill. Lawful 3.2-per-cent beer, therefore, can be sold on April 7 in States where it is legal.

Beer Bill

President Roosevelt sent a message to Congress on March 21 regarding unemployment relief, listing three types of legislation: (1) Federal enrolment of workers for public employment, to be started quickly and not to interfere with normal employment; (2) grants to States for relief work; (3) a labor-creating program by public works. In regard to (1), if he were given authority to proceed within two weeks, he estimated 250,000 men would be given temporary employment by early summer, the men to do work confined to forestry, prevention of soil erosion, flood control, and similar projects. He asked for additional appropriations for (2); and said he would soon make recommendations in regard to (3). In the Senate, legislation embodying his requests was introduced

jointly by Senators Robinson of Arkansas and Wagner, and in the House by Speaker Rainey, authorizing a civilian conservation corps, members of which shall be enrolled for one year unless sooner discharged, provided with food, clothing, quarters, etc., and paid not to exceed \$30 a month. Mr. Roosevelt in his message said that the existing organizations of the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and War could control and direct the work. —Meanwhile, consideration of the Administration's farm-relief legislation continued. The House Agriculture Committee favorably reported it on March 20, and on March 22 the House passed it without change, by a vote of 315 to 98, under drastic procedure prohibiting any amendments and forcing a vote after four hours' discussion. It was predicted that the bill would be radically changed from its present form in the Senate. The chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Senator Smith, said that he would not support the bill as submitted, and would move to strike out everything following the cotton clause, which he himself sponsored. Senator McNary, ranking Republican on the same Committee, announced that he would endeavor to limit the proposed relief to cotton and wheat. —On March 22 it was reported that Secretary of Labor Perkins had invited labor leaders and others, at the request of the President, to attend a conference on unemployment-relief measures, which was to be held on March 31 in Washington.

The President signed the economy bill on March 20, and preparations were being made for the issuance of executive orders to carry the reductions into effect. —

Other Legislation

The Steagall amendment to the emergency banking law, to permit State non-member banks and trust companies to apply directly to the Federal Reserve Banks for loans, instead of through member banks, was passed by the House on March 20. The bill was said to have the support of the Administration and the Treasury Department. It awaited action by the Senate.

President's Legislative Plan

Congressional leaders were informed by Mr. Roosevelt on March 20 that farm-relief, unemployment-relief, and railroad-consolidation legislation should be enacted at the special session. He hoped that these measures and other legislation could be passed by the early part of May, so that Congress could then adjourn until the regular session next January. Two days later, the State Department announced that after emergency domestic legislation had been disposed of, the President would ask Congress to consider commercial treaties.

Austria.—Political conditions continued critical as the parties marked time awaiting developments from the German revolution. The activities of the Heimwehr forces, particularly in their evident concentration around Vienna, caused the Socialists to protest. Police-Chief Brandel resigned because of the mobilization of the Heimwehr, and the Austrian Senate denounced the Government for playing into the hands of that element of the Heimwehr which was openly Pan-German and clamoring for immediate unity with the Nazi movement in Germany. In spite of the fact that Chancellor Dollfuss was trying to hold the country together under dictatorial powers, it was evident that many branches of the Heimwehr, with their well-drilled and armed detachments, were working with the Austrian Nazis to bring about this union.

Many of the royalists were strongly favoring the return of Otto, and the Socialists charged that their strength in Vienna foreshadowed a *coup d'état* for the monarchist party. Many stories of the movements of the Hapsburg prince were circulated, and the *Wiener Zeitung* carried a column of court news, a movement bitterly condemned in the Republican press. The recent announcements made in the Reichstag by Hitlerite leaders pointed to the success of the Pan-German movement in Austria. The Government set about reorganizing its banks and voted to advance \$20,000,000, accepting collateral which, though sound, is at present frozen.

Monarchist Threat

Canada.—Presentation of the annual budget program was made by Minister of Finance, Edgar N. Rhodes, on March 21. Total additions to the national debt for governmental operations and deficits on the Canadian National Railway amounted to \$156,122,000; the net debt was \$2,599,089,000. Revenues for the coming year were estimated at \$287,230,000, and expenditures at \$369,429,000. The deficit would be overcome by new proposals increasing taxes, yielding about \$70,000,000 and economy in government to the extent of about \$14,000,000. The income tax, it was proposed, would be increased in the basic rates; exemptions in lower incomes would be decreased, and a higher rate would be imposed on large incomes. Taxes would be increased on corporations and stock companies, and a tax placed on foreign investors. Mr. Rhodes pointed out that Canadian credit was good, Canada being the only country able to borrow in the public markets of the United States. He commended the strength and stability of the banking system.

Germany.—Chancellor Hitler and his National Socialists took advantage of their supreme power gained in an election notorious for its extreme coercion to make the opening of the Reichstag on March 21 a pageant of victory for a successful revolution. Orders were issued that the whole of Germany should enter enthusiastically upon this celebration, which was arranged with all the trap-

pings and glamour of the most dazzling period of the Empire. No one concealed the fact that what had recently taken place was a *bona fide* revolution, and that Hitler intended to act as a supreme dictator.

On March 21, the newly elected Reichstag met for its first business session of organization in the Kroll Opera House in Berlin after having witnessed a public dedication of the new regime to the ideals and spirit of pre-War Prussia. Services were also held in the Protestant and Catholic churches, but it was reported that both Chancellor Hitler and Dr. Paul J. Goebbels, though nominally Catholics, refused to attend the Catholic services because of the severe censures passed by the German episcopacy on some un-Christian tenets and practices of the Nazi party. Chancellor Hitler took his seat in the Reichstag for the first time and was loudly applauded. His address at the Garrison Church, in Potsdam, shortly before, in which he painted Germany's decline from its traditional glory and outlined the determined measures of his Government to establish unity of purpose and ideal, made him the popular idol. Within an hour the officers had been elected with Captain Goering, a National Socialist, as President, and Thomas Esser, a Centrist; Walther Graef, a Nationalist; and Ernst Zoerner, a National Socialist, as vice-presidents. It was noteworthy that only Dr. Esser received unanimous approval, being the only one to receive the endorsement of the Socialists. The vote on granting dictatorial rule was 441 for, and 94 against. The Reichstag adjourned sine die.

So severe was the censorship of news from Germany that it was impossible to form a judgment in regard to the cruelty and violence charged against the Nazi police and armed troops, as well as individual bands of fanatics drunk with their recent victory and taste of power. Reports coming from refugees in Austria and France painted a gruesome picture of barbarism, particularly in regard to the Jews and the Communists. The public announcements of Hitler before he became Chancellor and afterwards and the ruthless methods and principles of violence announced by Captain Goering helped to make the stories credible. Meetings of indignation and protest were being held by the Jews throughout the world, including a day of fast and prayer, and most Christian denominations joined them in denouncing the ultra-nationalistic spirit of the Hitlerite regime.

As predicted, Dr. Hans Luther, former-Chancellor, resigned as President of the Reichbank to make room for Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, seeking, as he himself said, to permit closer cooperation between the Government bank and the Hitler Cabinet. On March 18, word came from Washington that Dr. Luther was to be the new Ambassador to the United States. The announcement was well received. Dr. Schacht, who was formerly President of the Reichbank (1923-30) and famed for his ability in having stabilized the mark after the ruinous inflation, was unanimously elected. He has always been a strong supporter

Pan-German Movement

Reichstag Convenes

Budget Proposals

Nazi Excesses

Schacht Heads Reichbank

Revolution Celebrated

of Hitler. His first announcement assured foreign creditors that all debts would be paid. It was reported that in the present emergency he would expand credit, perhaps evaluate the mark to help local industries, and seek a full or partial transfer moratorium while seeking to convert short term foreign debts into a long term amortization plan.—Gold in the Reichbank continued to decrease, but there was an increase of reserve of foreign currencies. The ratio of reserve to outstanding circulation was 26.1 per cent.

India.—The British Government on March 17 issued the so-called White Paper on India, an official draft of the proposals to be incorporated in the Federal Constitution of India. The White Paper, a document of more than 100,000 words, included the major recommendations of the three round-table conferences held between British and Indian representatives. These recommendations, however, were not accepted by the British Government in their entirety; the demands, on the other hand, of the die-hard Conservatives led by Winston Churchill, who opposed the extension of self-government to India, were not followed by the Government. The document just published was presented to a joint committee of the two British Houses, and was subject to modification before the India bill is finally drawn up for introduction to Parliament in the autumn.

The New Constitution The new Constitution, as outlined in the White Paper, united in a closer bond the British Provinces and the States governed by native Princes. The Government was to be parliamentary, on the British system, consisting of Indians. The Central Legislature consisted of two houses: the Council of State, having 260 members, of whom 100 would be appointed by the native Princes, 150 elected by the Provincial legislatures, and 10 appointed by the Viceroy; and the House of Assembly, having 375 members, chosen by direct vote of the people. The Provincial legislatures, of which there are eleven, would consist also of two houses popularly elected for the most part. Suffrage was granted to about twenty-seven per cent of the male and female population, in total numbers, about 38,000,000 in elections for the Provincial legislatures. For the Federal House of Assembly suffrage was granted to only about 6,000,000. Representation of classes, about which discussion raged, followed the award formerly made by the British Government. The safeguards in regard to defense, foreign relations, currency, etc., were preserved to Great Britain. The power of the Viceroy in these matters was made absolute, and his power was also guaranteed in a list of "special responsibilities," that is, matters in which he superseded the authority of the Legislatures and Government. The Constitution was made dependent on two eventualities that could possibly delay its enactment, namely, the acceptance of it by a sufficient number of the native Princes, and the establishment of a Federal Reserve Bank.

As had been expected, practically all the intelligent

Indian sentiment was antagonistic to the proposals in the White Paper. The major complaint was that the British safeguards practically destroyed all real self-government in India and took away responsibility in major matters. In England, on the contrary, there was a belief that the proposals, though acceptable, were somewhat of a dangerous experiment since they granted too much power to the native Indians.

Japan.—China's resistance to Japan's aggressive attacks continued to weaken, and it was generally reported that with the elimination of Chang Hsiao-liang the Commander-in-chief, Chiang Kai-shek, would avoid any signs of aggression lest Japan carry out its threat of clearing out North China. General Hattori announced the taking of Saho-chiao, a town inside the Great Wall and nine miles south of the Sifeng Pass. Shanhaikwan's political status had not been determined after six weeks under Japan military control.

Peru.—Government dispatches from Lima contradicted reports from Bogota concerning the fighting in the Leticia area. It was claimed that the attack by warships was successfully repelled by Peru's air squadron. Both the warship Pinchincha and the transport Estafita were driven back without loss to the defenders. Colombia, however, celebrated victories along with the favorable decision of the League of Nations placing the blame on Peru.

Poland.—Fears, threats, and counter-threats continued to stir up war talk in Poland and Germany. Hitler's whole policy of nationalism which was prepared to use violence if necessary made the Corridor problem more acute than ever. Warsaw decided that it would be necessary to strengthen its military position near Danzig and in the Polish ammunition depot in the Westerplatte basin. Protests were made to the League of Nations by the Danzig Government. The German press accused Poland of large mobilization plans; but the charges were denied by the Polish authorities.

Russia.—Sir Esmond Ovey, British Ambassador, had an interview lasting an hour and a half with Foreign Minister Litvinov on March 16 to convey to him the views of the British Government concerning the recent arrest of six British subjects accused of sabotage. The following day M. Litvinov issued a communiqué stating: "No pressure or menace will be able to induce the Soviet Government to refrain from keeping its laws in relation to British subjects." The situation remained tense, extreme resentment being shown on both sides. The British were seriously considering warning all their citizens to leave Soviet Russia, while American electrical workers inquired of the Soviet Government as to whether respon-

Opposed Sentiment

Resistance Futile

Conflicting Reports

Danzig Trouble

British Workers

sibility for defective work lay with the company or with individuals.

Vatican City.—On March 18, the Holy Father named Monsignor Amleto Cicognani as Apostolic Delegate to Washington. The new delegate, who will be the sixth since the Apostolic Delegation was established in January, 1893, was to bear the title of Archbishop of Laodicea in Phrygia.—April 6, the first Thursday of the Holy Year, was chosen by the Pontiff to observe the exercises of the Holy Hour with special solemnities. The Pope stated that on that day he would assist in the ceremony at St. Peter's, and asked Cardinal Marchetti Selvaggiani, the Vicar of Rome, to urge his people to participate in the exercises in the churches of the city. Although the letter was addressed only to the Roman Vicar, the Pontiff expressed the hope that Catholic bishops throughout the world would invite their people to join in the Holy Hour observance, presumably at the same time.—Sir Robert Henry Clive was appointed British Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Holy See. Though not a Catholic, he is related to the Catholic family of the Earl of Denbigh. He is the fourth British Minister to the Vatican. The post had been left vacant for three years, since the recall of Henry Getty Chilton by the then Labor Government after the Vatican had condemned the anti-clerical activities of Lord Strickland in Malta. This Malta dispute was settled last June.

Disarmament.—After Prime Minister MacDonald of Great Britain and Premier Mussolini of Italy had conferred in Rome twice, on March 18 and 19, an official communiqué was issued stating that the latter had put forward a proposal "with the object of securing the collaboration of the four Western Powers in an effort to promote, in the spirit of the Kellogg pact and a 'no-force' declaration, a long period of peace for Europe and the world." It was generally understood in Rome that the plan called for a pledge by the four great Powers, France, Germany, Great Britain, and Italy, to enforce peace; and that the clauses of existing treaties would be revised which have been especially resented by the nations defeated in the World War. It was also understood that the proposal would form a basis of discussion at a conference of the Premiers of the aforesaid countries after France and Germany had had the opportunity to study the proposals.

Immediately after his final conference with Italy's Premier, Mr. MacDonald paid a visit to Pope Pius XI, who received him in his private library and kept him long in private conversation; imparting at the close the apostolic blessing to his work for peace. Mr. MacDonald later revealed that the Mussolini peace plan would not be limited to the great Powers of Europe, but would include all nations of Western Europe and perhaps Russia. The United States would be informed thereof. No truce or treaty was concluded. They were aiming at "not an im-

posed peace by a negotiated peace arising from the satisfaction of all countries that are in a position to disturb the peace. The change must be gradual. . . . Europe must be considered as a unit, with all its dangers and also all its support as unities."

Mr. MacDonald and Sir John Simon, British Foreign Secretary, then had a long interchange of views on their way home, with M. Daladier, French Premier, and M. Paul-Boncour, French Foreign Minister. As a result, the French Ministers affirmed their desire for peace, within the framework of the League of Nations, and for co-operation between the four great Powers. French press opinion, except from the Left, was anything but favorable to the proposal. Fear was expressed as to the fate of the smaller nations, now befriended by France, which would not join any "Four Power club," or "new Holy Alliance." At the best Britain could be an intermediary for Germany and France. Returning to England, Mr. MacDonald laid stress on treaty revision as paramount.

League of Nations.—On March 18, the Council of the League adopted a report concerning the dispute between Colombia and Peru, and the appeal of Colombia under Article XV of the Covenant of the League. The report recommended the complete evacuation of the Leticia district and withdrawal of all support from Peruvians who have occupied that area. The Council, thereupon, decided to appoint an advisory committee to watch the situation and assist the Council in the performance of its duties under Article IV, Paragraph 4, of the Covenant. The Governments of the United States and of Brazil were invited to collaborate as they thought best fit.

The report was accepted unreservedly by the Colombia delegate, Eduardo Santos, but effectively rejected by Francisco Garcia Calderon, delegate of Peru, who left the Council table, but later stated that Peru was not leaving the League. Secretary Hull, of the United States, acknowledged his notification, and appointed Hugh R. Wilson, American Minister to Switzerland, to participate in the committee, but without voting.

In this issue begins a most important series by R. Dana Skinner, on the bad economic effects of borrowed money. In the third article he will offer a novel proposal as the safest and best means to overcome them.

"Chimpanzee Buddy: What of It?" will be an interesting account of a surprising experiment by Francis W. Power, of the department of chemistry of Fordham University.

Florence D. Sullivan will bring together many facts in his article, "Whither Germany?"

John LaFarge will follow up his article on Russia in this issue by another in next week's in which current events will furnish the text. It will be called "Jewish Protests and Russian Experiments."

Apostolic Delegate

French and British Comment

Report on Leticia

Effect of Report

Italian Proposal

Visits Pope; Explains

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

SATURDAY, APRIL 1, 1933

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRED PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief

PAUL L. BLAKELY
GERARD B. DONNELLY

FRANCIS X. TALBOT
FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN
Associate Editors

JOHN LAFARGE
JAMES F. DONOVAN

FRANCIS P. LeBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: MEdallion 3-3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

War Clouds in Europe

SOME of our British brethren are exercised over the fact that the Oxford Union has gone on record against bearing arms for King and country. Their apprehension was probably not lessened when the men students of Manchester and Glasgow Universities passed the same resolution, thus stirring up, according to the Canadian Press, "a considerable fuss" among the patriotic. It cannot be maintained that all war is in itself evil, but it would be hard to maintain that most wars are begun and carried on only after the conditions which make war justifiable have been fulfilled. If that is the meaning of the vote at Oxford, Manchester, and Glasgow, we think the young men are merely echoing the sentiment of those who hope to keep Great Britain from an imminent war.

As the Holy Father pointed out in his recent Allocution, one of the most dangerous symptoms in public life today is excessive nationalism. It is this sort of nationalism, which has little in common with true patriotism, which is making all Europe an armed camp. After the dreadful carnage of the World War, and the hardly less dreadful sufferings which followed the conflict, it might be thought that Europe had plumbed the depths of the folly and wickedness of war. Yet today not only the Balkans, but France and Italy bristle with arms, as they never bristled before 1914, and by her course in the Far East Japan has dealt a blow that may yet prove deadly to the pacific powers of the League of Nations. Germany, under the lead of Prussia, as of old, is rattling the saber against Poland, and hoping for support from Italy. France issues protest after protest at the Nazi threats, and regards the movements of Fascist Italy with something akin to alarm. Meanwhile Great Britain, from her coign of vantage in the North Seas, sends her Prime Minister to Geneva and to Rome and Paris, in the hope of warding off the threatened conflict.

Troubles at home have turned our attention from the troubles on the Continent. It is disheartening to think

that all the work of the peace conferences, public and private, which have functioned with so much zeal since 1918, has gone for nothing. Perhaps that is too pessimistic a view. Perhaps the influence of Great Britain, joined with Holland and Switzerland, the traditionally neutral countries of Europe, and coupled with that of the United States, may yet serve to teach the world the blessings of peace. But surely the world today presents a sad spectacle of war and oppression, when Russia, Mexico, and Spain are in chains, while hostilities are carried on actively in South America and in the East.

The problem does not affect Europe alone. Probably nine out of every ten Americans think of war as the students at Oxford, Manchester, and Glasgow think of it. Our attitude in 1914 was the same, but it changed violently less than three years later, and as a people we then measured up to all the standards prescribed by the most exacting of militarists. Unfortunately we are all pacifists until someone by accident or design treads on our toe, and in that poignant moment, our meekness turns to wrath. Should Europe go to war, it is all but certain that we would follow, and that possibility is not one that brings cheer.

Viewing the machinery of the League of Nations, some of our theological brethren have concluded that the conditions which justify war can hardly ever be verified, but that machinery has now broken down. Meanwhile, all the reasons which urged our Catholic peace societies to organize and to spread their influence through the written and the spoken word, are even stronger than they were ten years ago. It is only the will to outlaw war, a will which draws its force from truly Christian principles, that can make war more remote, and some day, in God's good time, impossible.

Total Abstinence at Notre Dame

GOOD news comes from Notre Dame, a perennial source of good news. According to the annual religious survey issued by Father John F. O'Hara, C.S.C., the students of the University maintain an admirably balanced attitude on the use of strong drink. Out of 933 students who answered a questionnaire, 394 thought that moderate drinking was perfectly proper, 116 reported that they never drank intoxicating beverages, 68 were of the opinion that temperance was a difficult virtue, 35 believed that any use of intoxicants was dangerous, and while 18 declared total abstinence to be "foolish," 35 held that it was "advisable." But the best index, perhaps, of Notre Dame thought and opinion on this important matter is the fact that nearly 1,000 students have signed total abstinence cards.

We hope that all our colleges and universities will follow the example of Notre Dame in encouraging total abstinence. Any young man who contracts the habit of drinking, and by that we mean moderate drinking, has put himself under a handicap. It may do him no immediate harm, but it is always a source of danger, and it is difficult to see what good he can get from it. The generation now growing to manhood will have its drink problem

to solve no less than the generation which grew to manhood ten years ago, when the evils of Prohibition were rising to their height. An excellent beginning of a solution is total abstinence.

Whatever our position on Federal Prohibition, or on any kind of legal prohibition, all Catholic fathers, mothers, and teachers feel safer about the future of the young man who from religious motives promises total abstinence than about the future of the moderate drinker. The total abstainer has learned to deny himself, and the habit of self-denial is an admirable safeguard. Like the fear of Hell, it will save when the love of virtue grows faint in the zero hour of temptation.

Lobbies at Washington

WITHIN the past few weeks Congress and the President have hit the lobbies hard. The blow was so well directed that the lobbies are reeling, and it may be that the power exercised at Washington by well-trained professionals, who attempt to influence legislation in the ostensible interest of various groups, races, tribes, and societies, will soon be numbered with other extinct and unwholesome political activities.

The first of the lobbies to receive the blows of a not outrageous fortune is composed of the hosts once successfully led by the late Wayne Wheeler, chief of counsel for the Anti-Saloon League. For at least twenty years, this lobby has been powerful, and for the last thirteen it has just fallen short of political omnipotence. Under Wayne Wheeler it was directed with a certain degree of intelligence, for Mr. Wheeler always knew exactly what he wanted and how to get it. With the death of Mr. Wheeler, intelligent leadership passed, but by that time such leadership was hardly necessary, since the Anti-Saloon League and its affiliates had reduced Congress to a state of abject terror, and could obtain what it wished for the asking. Luckily for the country, the attempts to enforce Federal Prohibition at the point of a bayonet failed so dismally from the outset, that by 1928 the more intelligent of the "drys" began to appreciate the true character of this abominable "experiment." By 1932, the corruption and futility of Federal Prohibition had become apparent to a majority of our people, and they registered their opinion in an unmistakable manner at the November elections. The time when a Congressman could be influenced by Anti-Saloon menaces had passed.

The other routed lobby was composed of certain lawyers, publicity men, and former soldiers, who professed to speak in the name of the veterans of the World War. To what extent this profession was authorized has always been uncertain, since at the present time the American Legion numbers only from one-fourth to one-third of the combatants, many of whom have been and still are out of sympathy with the Washington lobbyists. But that the military lobby was hardly less powerful than the various troops who fought for the Anti-Saloon League is shown by its record. From the time of the Civil War, all changes in the pension laws have been in the line of increased allowances, and easier qualifications for the

recipients of Federal aid. The lobby had a situation made to its hand, but its skilled leaders were quick to suggest innumerable ways in which it could be improved. Granting that in their day these leaders had fought to save the country, they seemed wholly unable to realize that were their demands granted, little would be left of the country that had been saved. The so-called "economy bill" puts an end to these demands for the present. It is merely an emergency measure, but it stops the lobbyists short, and shows that their power is not greatly to be feared.

In itself, of course, a lobby is as harmless as a Sunday school, and it may at times serve a useful purpose by bringing to the attention of the members of Congress valuable information on proposed or pending legislation. It becomes objectionable, however, when it marshals the almost irresistible force of an organized minority against individual public officials, and threatens them with defeat unless they capitulate. That the lobby has been abused in all our State capitals as well as at Washington, can hardly be denied. The strong and determined action of President Roosevelt will not save legislators from improper influences, but may even save the lobby itself, by restoring it to its original useful position.

Labor Unions and the Law

THE controversy of a New York labor union with some of its members has ended with the union's organizer and former president sentenced to the penitentiary. With him a former member of the union's executive committee will sit in durance vile, employing the time, it is to be hoped, in reflecting that even an official of a union is not above the law of God and man.

Incidentally, the trial revealed the suspicious and extravagant practices which prevail in some labor unions. The president admitted that within twenty-two months he had handled "for strike purposes" about \$1,250,000 of the local's funds. That is a huge amount, and the members of the union might well have asked what the purpose of the fund was, how it was used, and with what good results to organized labor. The president also admitted that his annual salary from the local was \$21,800, and that within a period of three years, the local had voted him, "quite without his knowledge," gifts totaling \$55,000 for his "faithful service."

It is perfectly plain that to this alleged labor leader, the union was nothing but a racket. The propriety of any union paying its leader a salary of \$21,800 per year is questionable, but the propriety of adding a gift nearly equal to the salary, is not. A leader who had the interests of his union and of labor at heart, would have rejected it at once.

The American Federation of Labor seems to be taking a slightly higher degree of determination to stamp out these abuses than it did a few years ago. But even now, it can hardly be said that this degree is so marked as to fill the hearts of the racketeers with terror. The old defense of the Federation, that it could not interfere with the locals, is both threadbare and worthless. If its constitution forbids such interference, that constitution should

be modified. As matters now stand, it is quite possible for a local to be exploited by racketeers, while the Federation, presumably organized to promote the interests of organized labor, must stand by helplessly. It is that attitude which has identified the Federation, wrongly, we admit, but inevitably, with complete indifference to racketeering, and to the sufferings of labor-union workers compelled to submit to it.

The right of the workers to form unions to protect themselves by all proper means, is a right founded in nature, which neither the State nor any organization can deny. Every intelligent employer of labor will defend that right, for an attack upon it can easily change into an attack upon his own rights. Well-governed States and communities will also defend it, for when the rights of any group of citizens can be set at naught, the State itself is attacked. But these truths do not hide the fact that in the exercise of this right the laws of God and the legitimate prescriptions of the State must be scrupulously respected. They emphasize it.

How About Mexico?

THE stories of persecution of Jews coming out of Germany have stirred their coreligionists here to a pitch of fury and indignation. In this movement right-thinking persons in this country have joined. As Cardinal Hayes said to the newspapers, "It is certainly deplorable to have persecution added to the sorrows of the world." The censorship has aggravated the situation, for when there is censorship, rumors from border towns take the place of news. In view of all this the Jews of the country have asked their Christian fellow-citizens to join them in protest, and the request has been granted. The Federal Council of Churches and an organization called the Greater New York Interfaith Committee have issued protests likewise, and the State Department has taken cognizance of them.

Now here is a fair question. A persecution—of Catholics, of course—has been going on for some years in Mexico, and in savagery and concentrated hate it vastly exceeds anything that has been reported out of Germany. When did anyone ever hear about this Interfaith Committee issuing a protest about that? If Hitler and his followers really mean that they intend to stamp the Jewish religion out of Germany, then the same is true in a much greater degree of the Catholic religion in Mexico. Churches by the dozen have been stolen and defiled; Catholic schools confiscated; many Bishops have been exiled, including the representative of the Pope himself; priests hunted, tortured, and murdered; Sisters chased through the streets; lay men and women, just because they were Catholics, have lost their property, and in hundreds of cases their very lives; little children have been beaten up when they bravely proclaimed their love for their clergy. Is it not about time that some attention was paid to that also?

When we Catholics asked the State Department to take some cognizance of these facts, citing the very same precedents the Jews are citing now, we were told that it

was no affair of this country, that it was a matter of domestic concern for Mexico alone. Yet Germany is a foreign country, and Mexico is a semi-dependency of ours, in spite of all pretences to the contrary.

The papers, led by the *New York Times*, have played up the German persecutions day in and day out, all over their columns. Just try to get them to do the same for Mexico. The only answer you will get is that they are not in possession of the facts, a shameful admission for an enterprising press. The truth of the matter is that when the Jews go about getting publicity for protests over persecution, they mean business.

It is well that civilized nations join to protest when there is religious persecution in any land. Catholics do not begrudge the Jews this protest, and have readily joined with them to express their horror at what is reported out of Germany. Indeed, some Catholics have been heard who were silent when there was question of any public expression about Mexico or Spain or Russia. Let the protests go on. At the proper time we will ask the people of this country to say what they think about persecution of Catholics in other lands also.

Holy Year Inaugural

WE are informed that His Eminence, Cardinal Hayes, has invited leaders of "all faiths" to join with him in a public celebration to inaugurate the opening of the Holy Year in Rome. This "Holy Hour" will be held in Radio City Music Hall on Sunday morning, April 2, which is Passion Sunday. The arrangements committee is headed by the Most Rev. John J. Dunn, D.D., V.G., and by Grover Whalen as executive vice-president. Morgan J. O'Brien is chairman of the board and is accompanied by Nicholas Murray Butler and Henry Morgenthau. John McCormack and Martinelli are expected to sing, and other music will be furnished by the massed choirs of the Paulist church, the cathedral of St. John the Divine, and Temple Emmanuel, under the direction of the Rev. William J. Finn, C.S.P. The speakers will be Alfred E. Smith, Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, and Rabbi Alexander Lyons. President Roosevelt is also expected to take part, either in person or by radio. The celebration will take place from ten-thirty to noon, and will be broadcast on a world-wide hook-up. Cardinal Hayes will deliver the invocation and will speak.

The committee in charge designate this celebration as both a patriotic "and a religious act of consecration to God and nation." It is designed as an expression of alignment with the purposes of both the Holy Father in his wish for the winning of peace and order in the world through the exercises of the pilgrimages for the Jubilee in Rome and of President Roosevelt in his dedication of the nation to God in his inaugural speech, and his humble prayer for His assistance in the grave times through which we are passing. As a civic celebration it should do much, at this time of our Lord's Passion, to fulfil the Pope's wish that all those who profess the Christian name should unite in meeting the world's problems with courage and applying the principles of Christ to them.

Einstein and Galileo

WALTER J. MILLER, S.J.

IN the popular mind of the twentieth century, Albert Einstein is as much the personification of science as Galileo was in the seventeenth century. The theories of both men were equally incomprehensible to the masses of the people, but their brilliant discoveries, original minds, lifelong devotion, and self-sacrifice in the cause of science have made their names household words in every nation. Moreover, each of these "high priests of science" was gifted with a striking personality that stimulated publicity as soon as his genius had produced a substantial contribution to human knowledge. These contributions were notable even independently of Copernicanism and Relativity, with which their names are popularly associated; for Galileo is rightly called the Father of Mechanics and Dynamics, while Einstein received the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1921, not for the debatable Theory of Relativity but for his quantitative theory of the Brownian movement and his theoretical applications of Planck's Quantum Theory to photochemistry and photoelectricity.

Their dissimilarities are even more striking, and much more instructive. Einstein lives in an age that combines experiment with calculation—Galileo was militantly rebellious and unhappy in an age that investigated nature too often by mere appeal to authority. In general, people then were more concerned with preserving what was old than with promoting what was new. But we have grown used to revolutionary concepts, so often have we seen scientific hypotheses laboriously erected only to topple over a few months later when their substructure is undermined by the research they provoke.

The seventeenth century witnessed theories as novel as those of Einstein, but its conservative spirit dictated a reception far different than ours. Instead of proving or disproving scientific speculations by direct observation, the natural philosopher of that day had recourse to Aristotle, the Master *par excellence*, and in some quarters any questioning of his dictates was considered almost a blasphemy. Witness, for instance, the challenge of Galileo to the Peripatetics at the University of Pisa. Aristotle had reasoned *a priori* that the rate of descent of falling bodies is directly proportional to their weight. Galileo actually put this dictum to its first empirical test by dropping various weights simultaneously from the top of the famous Leaning Tower of Pisa, and showed that all the bodies reached the ground at the same time. But the Aristotelian professors, who were assembled below in the Campo Santo, would not accept even demonstrated facts when those facts contradicted their master.

Nowadays, when Einstein proposes a theory to explain "the *why* of the *how*" of Galileo's laws of falling bodies, and assigns an entirely different reason than the traditional "gravitation" of Newton, how different is our attitude! We do not think of appealing to authority—we demand the verdict of impartial investigation. The theories of Einstein must stand or fall by the facts, and conse-

quently in almost every nation today modern scientific enterprise is bent on confirming or refuting one or other of the three astronomical phenomena alleged by Einstein in support of the Generalized Theory of Relativity.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that the enthusiastic reception almost everywhere accorded to Einstein was equally prominent in the life of Galileo. Lest what is said about differences in the spirit of the age may seem to imply persecution of Galileo from the first, a few testimonies to the contrary may profitably be cited. Sir David Brewster, a Protestant, in his "Martyrs of Science," tells us:

Galileo was received with that distinction which was due to his great talents and his extended reputation. Princes, Cardinals, and Prelates hastened to do him honor; and even those who discredited his discoveries, and dreaded their results, vied with the true friends of science in their anxiety to see the intellectual wonder of the age.

Another Protestant, Von Gebler, writes:

He was received with the greatest honor. His triumphs were really extraordinary, so great that they were sure to secure for him numerous personal enemies in addition to the opponents of his doctrines. . . . Attentions of all sorts were heaped upon the astronomer. Pope Paul V granted him a long audience and graciously assured him of his unalterable good will. . . . The highest dignitaries of the Church testified their admiration.

A contemporary Cardinal penned this significant statement: "Were we still living under the ancient republic of Rome, I verily believe there would have been a column on the Capitol erected in honor of Galileo."

The saddest fact in Galileo's history is that he himself alienated much of this admiration and affection by enlisting against his own cause every prejudice which happened to exist in his age. Galileo's ruin was in large part brought about by faults in his character. A fierce controversialist, cocksure and headstrong, he rained contempt and poured out his scorn on all those who would not immediately and implicitly accept his findings. He refused to confine himself to the field of scientific inquiry, and never allowed the prevailing exegetical and philosophical views to adjust themselves to the advance of facts.

Both Einstein and Galileo are original thinkers who owe much to intuition. For them a process of analogical reasoning led to novel theories as yet unsupported by convincing facts. In the case of Galileo, his support was given to the Copernican theory fully twelve years before his telescopic discoveries of the phases of Venus and of the satellite system of Jupiter, which did so much to recommend the new theories to general acceptance. His genius had leaped to a conclusion to which others could not attain till the ladder of logic was provided for the climb. Einstein, too, acknowledges his debt to intuitions and inspirations, especially in regard to his Special and General Theory of Relativity. He says of himself, "I am enough of the artist to draw freely upon my imagination. Imagination is more important than knowledge."

Einstein was just as convinced as Galileo that his con-

clusions would tally with the facts, but in order to convince the modern world he had to provide experimental tests. He appealed to three crucial experiments made available on a vast scale by the God of nature. The most remarkable of these predictions of Einstein was the bending of starlight as it passed our massive sun. It was the apparent verification of this mathematical prediction (the most unanswerable of all arguments) at the solar eclipse of May 29, 1919, that made Einstein famous overnight as suddenly as Galileo in January, 1610, had become the greatest astronomer of his age by the discovery of four moons revolving around Jupiter in a way that paralleled exactly his surmises on the circumsolar orbits of the earth and the planets.

It must be noted here that even today the proofs alleged in support of Relativity are not conclusive, the amounts predicted being barely distinguishable because of the present limits of experimental accuracy; and if the predictions are eventually verified, it does not necessarily follow that the Theory of Relativity, which suggested the astronomical tests, is the only possible one that can be conceived to explain them. Galileo's evidence for Copernicanism was equally inconclusive, and he was absolutely unable to solve certain astronomical difficulties raised against the heliocentric hypothesis. In fact, the reason why Aristotle originally rejected the heliocentric theory of Pythagoras was astronomically correct and unanswerable until the triumph of modern astronomy in the person of Bessel in December, 1838. That reason was the confessed inability to detect those small stellar displacements called parallaxes which should be measurable on the supposition that the earth revolved around the sun. Indeed, the evidence of the senses was everywhere in favor of the immemorial belief of mankind in the stability of the earth.

Moreover, the facts alleged as proofs by Galileo arguing against the geocentric theory were either absolutely false or at best not cogent. The argument upon which he prided himself most was that taken from the flux and reflux of the earth's tides, which seemed to him to be visible effects of terrestrial rotation on its axis and revolution around the sun. Galileo actually ridiculed the correct explanation, suggested by his contemporary Kepler, that the tides were due to lunar action. Galileo's argument was rightly opposed by the alert scientists of his day, and we know now that it is untenable and worthless. Likewise, it is universally admitted today that the orbital movement of the earth was not proved by any of his arguments, even those concerned with the moons of Jupiter, the phases of Venus and the spots on the sun. Granted that the Ptolemaic system could not "save the phenomena," granted also that the Copernican theory could do so, could not many another system be devised that would explain the facts even better and more accurately? And in point of fact, does not Einstein's General Theory of Relativity claim that the phenomena would be indistinguishable should the sun and the whole universe of stars be revolving about the earth?

If it be conceded that their cases are parallel so far,

what is the ultimate reason why Galileo aroused a crushing storm of opposition from the Aristotelians, while Einstein is acclaimed as the prophet of science? Quite apart from Galileo's dabbling in theology, in which after all he was but an uneducated layman, he had certainly succeeded in arousing the theologians' fears of that dangerous private interpretation which was so suspect after the Reformation controversies, no less than the Church's apprehension of dangerous psychological effects destructive of the Faith of the uneducated masses who could not follow his scientific arguments.

The most obvious reason, however, for the tragedy of Galileo was Galileo himself. While still a student at the University of Pisa, Galileo's controversial temperament had earned for himself the title of "The Wrangler." As a professor there, he seemed to take unholy delight in pugnaciously baiting and ridiculing his Aristotelian colleagues. This was characteristic of him during all his life. That Galileo was eventually silenced because of his extreme intemperance is attested by a dispatch of Piero Guicciardini, the Tuscan Ambassador in Rome. Dated the day before the first adverse sentence, it was written to a court that idolized Galileo and would not have tolerated any misrepresentation of him:

Galileo sets more store by his own opinion than by the advice of his friends. Cardinal Del Monte and myself . . . as well as other Cardinals of the Holy Office, have endeavored to pacify him and to persuade him not to stir up this affair, but, if he wished to hold his opinion, to hold it quietly, without using so much violence in his attempts to force others into holding it. We all doubt very much whether his coming here is not going to prove prejudicial and dangerous for him. . . . I do not think that there is any possibility of Galileo suffering in person, because as a good and prudent man he will be ready to submit to the decision of the Church. But he gets hotly excited about these views of his, and has an extremely passionate temper, with little patience and prudence to keep it in control. It is this irritability that makes the skies of Rome very dangerous for him. . . .

No wonder that professional theologians should have resented Galileo's vehement attempts to enlighten them, especially since these hotheaded efforts were invariably accompanied by sarcastic aggressiveness and ridicule. Incidentally, however, we must remember that the imprudence and conceit of Galileo in forcing an official pronouncement does not diminish the deplorable error which that pronouncement contains.

Suppose now that even in this age of enthusiasm for fact and rebellion against authority, Albert Einstein had triumphantly assumed the cause as won in 1919, and had dogmatically proclaimed the Theory of Relativity as a securely established law. Suppose he went out of his way to ridicule all who still believed in the so-called classical or traditional gravitational theory of Newton's mechanics. What a storm there would have been! This is no empty hypothesis. Einstein could have elected to defend his theory energetically against all opponents. But no! he had proposed his theory as a working hypothesis. Taking present scientific knowledge to be provisional, he was ready to welcome any revision of his theory based on independent observations. When he saw the first observational evidence accumulating in its favor, he showed him-

self a true scientist by being content to seek new facts and new deductions to establish it more firmly. He knew that even when new ideas are brought forward skilfully, not everyone has a heart so free from prejudice as to be ready to accept the arguments for what they are worth;

and Einstein was not the man to force his theories recklessly and offensively down another man's throat. Had Einstein's seventeenth century prototype been as prudent, history would never have recorded the tragedy of Galileo.

An Open Letter to Ambassador Daniels

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

DEAR Mr. Daniels:

The news that you have just been appointed Ambassador to Mexico prompts me to sit down and tell you something about the country to which you have been accredited. Needless to say, I wish you all success in your new post, the first official one you have occupied since you left the Cabinet in 1921. A man of your age may find the high altitude of 7,500 feet very trying, but no doubt your Counselor, Arthur Bliss Lane, will be able to find you a nice place of retirement down at Cuernavaca, as Mr. Morrow did. You must visit the Morrow place; it is a little paradise. The real boss of Mexico, ex-President Calles, lived at Cuernavaca, but recently left for the West, unfortunately, for you would have had more to do with him than with the Government departments; at least, if you wished to expedite things. The Archbishop of Mexico, Msgr. Diaz, since his recent illness, has been living down there, too.

You will find the politics of the country somewhat disturbed. The term of the present Provisional President, Gen. Abelardo Rodriguez, does not expire for some time yet, but the aspirants for his place are many. You will recall that this is the term of General Obregon, who was murdered before his inauguration; his place was taken by Portes Gil, who was forced out and induced to take a trip to Europe. Ortiz Rubio succeeded him but was shot at on his inauguration day, and then and there lost his taste for the position; one of his relatives later got mixed up in a graft scandal, and he was induced to leave for California, where he now is. The present man, a personal favorite of Calles, has been in for less than a year. Visitors to Tia Juana will remember him as Governor of Lower California, where he cast a fatherly eye once in a while over the gambling establishments there.

As I said, a number are in the field to succeed him. There is only one political party there, of course, so the real fight is for the nomination, which means for the favor of General Calles. Perez Treviño and Riva Palacios, old hands at the game, were recently at odds over it, and it seems the former has won out, temporarily. Another gentleman, former Secretary of War General Amaro, was once 'way in the lead, but he got too friendly with Ortiz Rubio, and accompanied him to the border. (Your predecessor went to the station to see them off.) I think if you look in the Embassy files you will find that Amaro was our Government's candidate for the office. You will undoubtedly hear from him again. He is an able little Indian, with no formal education, but with tremendous energy and ambition.

You and your staff will have a lot to do with the various American interests which have properties in Mexico. There is a little matter of some hundreds of millions of dollars of external debt on which nothing has been paid since December, 1927. The exact amount is uncertain, but in 1927 the recognized public debt was \$626,552,849, of which unpaid interest accounted for \$198,289,000. Added to this was also about \$250,000,000 of damage and agrarian-confiscation claims, which you may be able to settle; no other Ambassador has ever been able to do so. Thomas W. Lamont, of Morgan's, handles the debt matters for the International Bankers' Committee. The per-capita debt of Mexico is only about \$30, which is small as Latin American countries go, but investors in Mexican bonds felt the depression long before those who put their money in Peruvians.

Then there is, of course, the oil question. It was settled, after a fashion, by Mr. Morrow, through a gentlemen's agreement which at first satisfied the Mexican Government, but not the oil companies, who have let production fall to very low figures compared with ten years ago, to the great loss of Mexico in both production and export taxes. These companies are happy now in Colombia and Venezuela, but some day will turn their eyes back to Tampico. What will then be the state of Mexican oil law will at that time interest you no little.

There are various other American interests in Mexico that are in trouble from time to time, such as textiles, railroads, copper, silver. They usually, however, manage to settle their own troubles by a judicious use of timely "sweetening," as their officials will tell you. What is more likely to absorb your time is the position of the power companies—to be explicit, the American and Foreign Power, a subsidiary of Electric Bond and Share. In Mr. Morrow's time, this company managed to amass perhaps a majority of the power sites, and very many of the distribution lines and local companies. Not very long ago, the present President enunciated a doctrine on power suspiciously similar to the old oil doctrine. You will no doubt see the time when the Government will be asserting rights over the power companies as they did over oil in Sheffield's time. They will count on the presumed hostility of Mr. Roosevelt's Government to the utilities, as they did with Coolidge's to Sinclair and Doheny, and that will be very embarrassing to you, I'm afraid.

A curious little incident happened in December which may throw some light on Mexico as it is today. Vegetables were proclaimed a public utility in the States of Sonora and Sinaloa, and the marketing monopoly was

conferred on Wells Fargo, to the disgust and alarm of Standard Marketing and other competing American companies. When anything is a public utility in Mexico, the authorities may do almost anything they like with it. That is the law.

As you get around the city of Mexico you will see no trace of clergymen on the streets nor any Sisters, as you might in your own State of North Carolina, even with its sparse Catholic numbers. The reason is that it is forbidden to wear the Roman collar, still less the usual clerical garb, or indeed any sign of religious affiliation, for example a Holy Name or Knights of Columbus pin. (A Masonic pin and watchguard will be allowed to circulate, of course.) If you go out early Sunday mornings you will see enormous crowds of men and women storming the churches. That may look to you like a refutation of the claim that Catholics are persecuted down there. The reason for the crowds is that only one priest and one church are allowed for every 40,000 people, and there are about a million people in the city and District. At an average, one priest and one church can care, with three Masses every Sunday by special dispensation, for only about 3,000 people.

So in a parish where you see large crowds at Mass, you can reflect that by law 37,000 others are deprived of the consolations of religion. Catholicism is a weekday religion, too, what with Baptisms, confessions, marriages, sick calls, catechism, and consultations for advice. About the same number of people are deprived, by the sheer physical impossibility of one priest getting around to 40,000, of any of these ways of practising their religion. In some States, too, the situation is worse. In Vera Cruz, for instance, the figure is one priest for 100,000. In that State, however, all the churches are closed now and all priests hunted down by the officials, and two or three of them have been killed lately. Tejeda, who is running for President as an independent radical, hates all religion and sees to it that no religion is practised in his State. When he was Governor, aided and abetted by some people up here, he passed a *compulsory* birth-control law, which Catholics considered an intolerable outrage on their Faith. Having more than two children, if you are poor, is a crime. That is the law.

I suppose you are wondering why I am telling you all this. What can you do, the envoy of a foreign country, in a matter which is so purely the internal affair of Mexico? Can you afford to subject yourself to the rebuff of being told to mind your own business? Well, that might have been said once, but not now. Not since Morrow. Mr. Morrow made it his own business, and had some success at it. He was sincere about it, too, and if he had lived, the present horrors, which I will tell you about, would not have happened, but his successor took less interest. In any case the precedent exists, and if you go about it the right way, in the name of common humanity, you can confer a service on mankind.

I suppose you know that all foreign clergymen are forbidden to operate there. Up to recent times this ban fell only on Catholics, but under the present President

Protestants are out, too. Bishop Frank Creighton, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, just lately gave up trying to go back, and took up his duties on Long Island as assistant to Bishop Stires. So you see if you wish to go to church and hear a sermon, you will have to choose some Mexican preacher and hear him in Spanish. This is quite a change from the days when you were Secretary of the Navy and Bishop Cannon used to come around to your colleague's office in the State Department and give him orders about what was to be done in Mexico.

Your own Chief in the White House those days was bedeviled by more than Bishop Cannon over Mexico. A combination of missionaries and liberals kept him and the Government in such hot water that the Mexican chapter of that Administration is, as you know now, the least pleasant portion, alas! of its history. Wilson's unfortunate interference for Carranza, and Hughes' later similar intervention for Obregon, are the twin evils that have poisoned all Mexican-American relations. One result, however, of all that is that the American Ambassador is a paramount influence in Mexico. Even foreign envoys go to him before they approach the Minister of Foreign Relations. The Mexican sovereignty was then permanently impaired in our favor. Nobody knew this so well as Mr. Morrow, and your own career down there will, of course, be judged according to the popular notion of his. You will find, too, that our own liberals are feeling the present tyranny to be a little shameful and the Protestants are in the same boat with us.

When you get to Mexico, I would suggest that you take a trip out to Guadalajara, in Jalisco. This is the most populous State, and the most Catholic. There priests are being hunted by officials; one of them was recently stabbed to death on the altar; another was beaten up in an approved church, and his assailants were mobbed by the boys to whom he was teaching catechism. He was taken to prison and tortured. A houseful of Sisters was attacked and some of them jumped out the window to save themselves. Several Sisters are being held in prison. Churches and schools which have legal approval are raided and confiscated. Spies cover the State to catch priests in violation of the "law." Laymen whose blood boils over at the outrages are arrested and usually killed "as they attempt to escape."

These are just some of the things that are going on down there now, and I wanted to call your attention to them. In the name of humanity and of religion, I adjure you to use your best influence to stop them.

P. S. In January an American citizen named Jerome Reutermann lost his home in Tacubaya. He had bought it from a Mexican, who had it from a family to which it had been willed by a Bishop. The Supreme Court decided three to one that it belonged to the State. The reason was that there is on the estate a chapel built long ago by the Bishop, and all chapels and the grounds around them belong to the State. I do not know Mr. Reutermann, nor if he is a Catholic. I suggest you call him to see you. He will probably be able to tell you a lot.

Inside the Roman Collar

FRANCIS TALBOT, S.J.

SOONER than I had expected am I permitted to continue my observations of last week in respect to the starched white band around a priest's neck that has come to be called the Roman collar. What I wrote then has been graciously referred to by the Editor as "erudition." I fear to forecast what term he may apply to what I am writing hereinafter, or what remarks may be passed on it by the other 28,296 similarly collared gentlemen of the cloth, exclusive of the seventeen and the one-hundred-and-five who prescribe as well as don the "regular stiff double foldover."

Some fashion there must be that distinguishes the anointed with the three indelible marks on his soul from the anointed of two or one and the unanointed. He is a man set apart from the commonalty, one with an unworldly office, who holds a spiritual grade and ranking, distinguished by God and therefore distinguishable among men. The fashion is a mere matter of taste, or tradition, or custom, or symbolism, or what you will. It may be a quasi-bodily mark, like the tonsure. It may be a complete, enfolding form of dress, like the street cassock worn in Catholic countries, with a hat as cumbersome. Or it may be the very attractive, if unsoiled, the easily adjusted, though at times uncomfortable, starched white neckband gleaming in a totally black ensemble. Since there must be a uniform for the priest, as an officer in God's army, even in lands as heretical as ours, the Roman collar is as convenient and as beautiful and as distinctive an article of apparel as any I could conceive.

During my many happy years of confinement within the Roman collar, I have never become unconscious of it. That, perhaps, is one of the sensible reasons why it should be worn, to make us priest conscious. But I can confess safely to a harmless foible, as it were, a silly idiosyncrasy. I shrink from, I detest, being conspicuous. But the Roman collar immediately makes its wearer highly conspicuous. That is the only thing about it that I dislike. It draws all eyes unto itself, and thence to its wearer. So that, wherever he appears, the priest proclaimed by his neckband as a priest is the target for glances shot out by pairs and pairs of eyes. In the earlier years I used to feel self-conscious under the glare; but never apologetic; rather, the self-consciousness expressed itself in defiance and pridefulness. Now, with my sensibilities hardened, or no longer being sensibilities, I am never self-conscious about the wearing of the collar. It has become as much a part of me as the Adam's Apple it conceals, and, be it said, sometimes irritates.

Let the Roman collar pass down the street, and it draws a look from every passerby and lounge. Let it enter a street car or a subway train, and it attracts the attention of all the optic nerves. Let it walk into a restaurant, and it distracts, for a moment, all the diners from their plates. Everywhere, it is the cynosure. That may be an embarrassment to the face above it which, in turn, is intently

studied. Those glances, those innumerable glances which are turned toward the Roman collar and the priest which it symbolizes and proclaims, how mysterious they are, how open both to interpretation and misinterpretation, how fascinating a subject for speculation! Ordinarily, the priest is habituated to them and so is not conscious of them and so pays no attention to them. But sometimes he wonders at them and tries to evaluate them.

Whatever is going on in the minds of these silent, staring strangers? All that they ever thought about the Catholic Church. If the Catholic Church is an affront to them, their eyes are hostile to the Roman collar. If the Catholic Church is the Scarlet Woman, the black-coated, white-collared priest is a devil, and their eyes do not conceal their thought. I have read concentrated hate in many eyes that kept boring into me while I rode placidly in the Subway. But I have read far more that is lovely and Christ-like, and that in eyes that never saw the inside of a Catholic Church and that never looked up to the real Christ lifted aloft at Mass. A film of awe or reverence passes over the eyes of many non-Catholics who believe in God and who are not jaundiced by false Christianity when a Roman-collared priest comes into view. I have experienced it, and have been humbled by it, even awed. That look was as potent as a grace from God, which in fact it might be, impelling me to be a worthier wearer of the collar. But it is in the eyes of Catholics that the Roman collar begets a gleam of love, of recognition, of friendliness, of a kind of mellow welcome. These looks are energizing to the priest, they give him the soft heart of a father to his children. So that, the priest in public places is always kept conscious of being the priest by the battery of eyes on his Roman collar.

While the Roman collar may be the occasion for petty martyrdom, it is almost universally a band of honor. This may be a civilized country, but it contains savages and bigots. At Times Square, for example, a weasel-faced creature whom I judged to be Communistic delivered an elbow thrust into my ribs; he had stared me out of countenance while he had been sitting opposite me, stared murderously at me for several minutes; as we left the train together, he vented his wrath and escaped in the crowd. There is the disrespectful youngblood who has his little joke of apparently lifting his hand to his hat but cuts the gesture short at the nose; wearing the Roman collar, of course, the priest does not respond in an answering salute. Once, I was cursed outright by a burly old Scotchman or North of Ireland man, sired straight from Cromwell. He was walking toward me and as he drew near and saw my Roman collar he stopped and lifted his arm and hissed: "May God strike you down." I smiled sadly at him and lifted my hat jauntily, and said a prayer for him as I went my way. Little adventures, these, that give zest to a life inside the Roman collar.

On the other side, there are richer and happier rec-

ords. The *Christian Advocate*, Methodist, quotes the following from the *Churchman*, Episcopal:

That the Roman collar has certain advantages nobody who has attempted to pass a red traffic light in New York will deny. . . . Worn in conjunction with a certain type of decorated and buttony rabat, it frequently gives us the thrilling experience of being addressed as "Father" by unsuspicious Irishmen, and on two occasions I have had my tires changed on the road by pious members of another church.

Though the minister who thus parades in the Roman collar may speak wittily of his impertinences and false pretensions, his facts could be abundantly attested by every priest. The Roman collar curries favor almost universally. It is received, almost everywhere, with true courtesy. It is a standing joke about the priest caught by a traffic officer in the violation of rules, though I could name two instances in which the traffic officer violated the joke. It is a continued marvel, to me, at least, what kind offices are rendered by policemen, porters, waiters, railroad agents, taxi drivers, clerks, floor walkers, department managers, big executives, presidents, secretaries, Jews and gentiles, men and women and children, old and young, elevator operators, policemen, I think I mentioned them before, Knights of Columbus and Masons and Elks, and all sorts and conditions of people, to the man who wears the Roman collar. They respect the collar, they trust the man inside it, they want to be helpful to him, and they almost spoil him by their kindness. The only flaw in the vestment is the fact that the Roman collar is not patented for exclusive use by Roman clerics, or the fact that it can be used for masquerade or rackets by the crook.

I judge that the Roman collar is a badge of honor because the men who wear it have made themselves worthy of being honored. And I venture to say that they have been inspired (as only a partial motivation, of course) to show themselves worthy of being honored because of the Roman collar on them. They are conscious of the livery of the great King, *noblesse oblige*. They know that the reputation of more than 28,000 fellows hangs on them; morale, that is, and loyalty. They feel the collar closing in on their neck and they remember they are priests of God. So, while the collar begets respect from those who view it from without, it engenders self-respect in those who encase themselves in it.

At the same time, the wearer of the Roman collar suffers infringements of his personal liberty in many matters that are innocent. In the near future, for example, he may be just in the mood for a glass of 3.2, a simple diversion for one who could take the stuff; but to enter a saloon would be, probably, if history repeats itself, a roaring scandal. He may feel the need for a few puffs of a cigarette as he walks along the street, but he decides he better not. He might be filially inclined to escort his mother home, after a late visit to relatives, but he will think it better to trust her safekeeping to God. He feels, and is felt to be, out of place in a dining room, though under the best auspices, where, say, dancing is permitted. In a word, he is open to a thousand petty limitations because he is Roman collarized; and he feels a thousand minor inhibitions within himself. He is on parade. He

is severely criticized for being worldly, if he is but acting innocently as a man. But it is not nearly so mournful as it sounds. Ordinary restrictions become a matter of habit and routine, and extraordinary restrictions have no binding power. In this I am reminded of an innocent young convert who expressed surprise when she heard that a priest had been surf-bathing. She could not comprehend, first of all, that such a thing would be allowed. But then, granting that it was permitted, she could not imagine how he could clip his Roman collar on to his bathing suit and keep it stiff in the water.

Small penalties are such as these that restrict the freedom of the priest to act even as pious laymen. The white band of innocence demands that the conventions must be observed. And the scorn from hostile anti-Catholics, that is a fillip for the Lord, accepted exultantly. There is compensation a million-fold. For the man inside the Roman collar is treated as no other man who lives. He is always given precedence, whether it be at a festive gathering or at a tragic accident. He is given welcome and love, he is hailed with respect, for he wears the white band of trust. The ring about his neck proclaims him wedded to his God.

Distractions and Reality in Russia

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

THE arguments that are advanced from time to time in favor of the recognition of the Soviet Government generally assume, or assert, that things are not now what they were. Once upon a time, of course, in old, forgotten days, the Soviet regime did promote a policy of enmity towards existing Governments and institutions, they did issue manifestoes calling upon other nations to revolt, but that is all over now. Their present policy is one solely of interior reconstruction and peace. Some such idea seems to have entered the head of one of our most beloved statesmen, who pronounced casually upon the matter of late; and into the mind of so sober a thinker as Walter Lippmann, who does not find that the Amtorg or other trading institutions of the Soviet Government in the United States are trying to upset things. But why should they? Seeing that there are a thousand other channels through which to act, why should the Soviet Government, presumably intelligent, wish to cut the last thread which binds them to an ever-diminishing foreign trade?

Yet, as the simple instances showed that I used in my article of February 18, this attitude of the Third International is unchanged, and what is good for the Komintern is good for the Government as well. How little credence is to be placed in all the talk of "devotion to purely interior affairs," of a policy of world peace, and so on, that we have been hearing for the last year or so, is shown by Walter Duranty's dispatch of March 6 from Moscow, to the following effect, apropos of Hitler:

The Communist International has reversed its policy of Communist party exclusiveness of recent years and has reverted to a "united front" of all workers' parties under a manifesto issued January 22 and published in the newspaper *Pravda* today. . . .

The manifesto, signed by the executive committee of the Comintern, instructs Communist parties throughout the world, first, to arrange a joint program of action with the Second International and other labor organizations—that is, combined staff work; second, to form committees immediately for joint action with workers and other parties—that is, combined field work.

Thus a "united front" is to be formed throughout the world for common action. There is nothing novel therein, except that the appeal is renewed to the Second International.

This being the real issue, it is not strange that every attempt should be made by the party most interested therein to distract attention from anything that might prejudice recognition. The economic argument, for instance, is put forward that American trade with Russia has suffered a terrible loss because of our non-recognition. According to the latest figures, the Soviet Union imported from the United States in 1932 only \$12,466,249, as compared with \$114,398,537 in 1930. But is it so clear that this loss of trade is all due to lack of political recognition? Our Canadian exports, for instance, dropped in three years from \$100,000,000 to \$15,000,000. Recognition might ease commerce somewhat, but is by no means necessary therefor. Even the most enthusiastic Soviet apologists do not deny that one immediate reason for this drop in trade is the unwillingness of American business to grant credits to Russian enterprise. Apart from the situation created by the depression, our financiers have lost confidence in those projects which seemed so vastly attractive a few years ago. The reports from this investment field are too numerous, too varied and circumstantial to arouse confidence in experienced men. What they are asked to underwrite, and will be asked still more insistently to underwrite if recognition is granted, is not the *enterprises of Russians*. It is a single, unified Government business concern. And so far this concern has been unable to suppress the general suspicion as to its failure.

To ascribe these suspicions to "anti-Soviet propaganda" is beside the point, since the propaganda, in this case, is that made by the utterances of the official Soviet organs themselves. Not only once or twice, or for a brief period, but daily for months the complaints mount up from Soviet sources, confirmed by the pro-Soviet press reports from Moscow, that the peasants of Ukraine, the lower Volga region, and the North Caucasus refuse to fit into the collective-farm system. But the collective-farm system is now, as the Government frankly acknowledges, the keystone of the entire Soviet economic machine. The regions mentioned are not just certain "backward provinces." They are the richest grain fields of Russia; and a fair proportion of Russia's area, whether we look at European Russia or at the whole Soviet Union, is agriculturally unproductive or poorly productive. Moreover, the peasantry of these regions are not of the passive and fatalistic Great Russian variety. Intense nationalistic aspirations still prevail among them; indeed, have been heightened by the cultural autonomy so liberally given at the beginning of the Soviet regime, and so anxiously limited by Stalin in later times. The news, therefore, of

45,000 peasants forcibly driven away from their homes at one swoop, to be exiled to forced labor in the wilderness, is no mere incident. Nor is confidence increased when the Moscow dispatches for American consumption explain it away by the absurd exclamation: "Why, what is that to the 10,000,000 Americans cut loose from their homes by the depression?"

The shock brigades, or *udarniki*, are the fighting front in the Government's collective farm, as in the industrialization scheme. For the last three or four years they have been always on the point of "going over the top," of annihilating all retrogression and opposition by one huge effort. The general "Manifesto to all Peasants and Collective-Farm Workers" issued by the first All-Union congress of collective-farm shock brigaders on February 20 of this year, features largely the unfortunate state of things created by the aforesaid elements. Complaint is made that loyal shock brigaders working year in and year out in the North Caucasus, or in the Ukraine, or on the Lower Volga, have been overwhelmed with the resistance of "damagers, kulaks, crooks, thieves, evil-minded wastrels," who still cannot see the benefits of the new system.

A kindred matter is earnestly discussed, by the same manifesto, the significance of which is evident in view of former proclamations. In the Moscow *Pravda* for December 17, the statement is made that in the year 1913 agriculture in the North Caucasus was provided with 3,288,000 horse power, all animal draught. In 1931 this had shrunk to 1,604,314 horse power, of which 425,314 was mechanical horse power. In the New York *Times* for February 19, of this year, "E. Yourievsky," a Socialist economist, makes the following comment on these figures:

Under such a terrific decline of horse power, agricultural activity is enormously retarded and the consequent losses are tremendous. I call particular attention to this fact because Stalin and his entourage are constantly emphasizing with satisfaction that "they gave" to agriculture "120,000 tractors" (see resolution of the plenum of the Central Committee). They forgot to add that these tractors of very doubtful quality do not cover the enormous loss in natural horse power suffered by agriculture as a result of the forcible collectivization. The 120,000 tractors represent a total of 1,900,000 horse power as against a loss of 2,109,000 horse power in Northern Caucasus alone.

The Five Year plan promised an increase of 71,000,000 in the number of horses, horned cattle, sheep, and pigs as compared with 1928. The actual result for the whole of the Soviet Union was a decrease of 109,000,000.

Last year the Moscow press hailed with derision, as of a counsel of despair, the news that American farmers, in some localities, were replacing tractors with horses. But the shock brigaders, in this February manifesto, are exhorted not to speak disrespectfully of the horse. The "kulak" is quoted as remarking: "Spit upon the horse—the Government is giving you tractors!" And actually, we are told, "in many collective farms they did spit upon the horse." But now, spit no longer. For one, tractors will sink in the mud when you start the spring plowing. "The stableman is as necessary as the tractor mechanic." And the moustachioed old cavalry general, Budyonny, is

summoned, under thunderous applause, to address the shock brigaders upon the place of quadrupeds in the what-was-once-five-year-plan.

To distract the public mind from all such unpleasant turns of fortune, to exonerate the Government management, and to throw the blame squarely upon "damagers, thieves, crooks, robbers, and all the rest of the kulak-White-Guard braggadocio," to use the gentle language of the shock brigaders, the Government seized on March 4 seventy persons, all workers in the Commissariats of Agriculture and of Collectivized Farming. They "destroyed tractors and farm machinery, burned tractor stations, sowed weeds, stole grain, and killed cattle to accomplish their ends." Thirty-five persons, including some of the former, were announced on March 11 as executed for "counter-revolutionary activity and sabotage in connection with farming in the Ukraine, North Caucasus, and White Russia." This, said the Government, would be "an object lesson to a reluctant peasantry in the Ukraine and North Caucasus, which, although they are the richest potential producers in the Soviet Union, have been the most backward States since 1931 in developing resources and aiding in the required grain collections."

To complete the object lesson, and give further distraction from the real cause of the trouble, the Government staged on March 13 the arrest of six British engineers and construction workers with their Russian "accomplices" of the Metropolitan-Vickers Company, on the ground of "damaging" the electric-power station which they had under construction in Moscow, Chelyabinsk, the Donets Basin, and elsewhere. The stage was immediately set for a propaganda trial, such as that of 1930, when Winston Churchill and Raymond Poincaré were among the defendants, and a Russian emigré already in his grave was solemnly convicted of conspiracy against the sovereign State. As in former trials, it all depends upon the merest whim of momentary expediency whether the defendants, after interminable questions and third degrees, are promptly shot to death, or as inexplicably released.

The British Government in this, as in so many other affairs, has few illusions. They look upon it, according to London reports, "not as an isolated incident but as the start of a concerted anti-foreign campaign to mask the alleged failure of the Bolshevist industrialization program." In the meanwhile, Mr. Duranty takes pains to inform us that the Russians love the Americans more than they do any of the Europeans. We share with the Russians the "aspiration to build something newer, bigger, and better," or we did until the great deflation. The Germans analyze too much; the French ask too many questions. The British are hateful; they just will *not* believe. In other words, the wretched Europeans have seen too much, and have too long a memory. But Americans can make allowances.

That is a noble trait. God loves the man who makes allowances. But as people grow wiser, they make, not fewer allowances, but those based more on knowledge, less on emotion. Americans have gradually been learning about Russia since 1929.

Economics

Leverage and Profits

R. DANA SKINNER

EVEN those bewildering gentlemen, the academic economists, will agree these days with the supposedly hard-headed bankers that the world has been suffering from an overdose of debt. But the question that is rarely put and hardly ever answered is this: just when does a mountain of debt become an overdose? When if ever do we have a "healthy" amount of debt, and when do we have too much? Why does the world rush delightedly into debt during periods of rising prices, and discover that the pile is too high only when prices turn downward, and the debts can no longer be easily paid? Are we to assume that debt is always "healthy" as long as it can be paid off? And, parenthetically, since the use of credit involves the creation of a debt, what are we to think of the bankers and economists who, in one breath, tell us that there is too much debt today, and in the next breath, insist that the only cure is to expand credit—that is, create more debt?

Obviously, these must be root-searching questions, or they would have been answered satisfactorily long ago. In the present articles, I am going to try to show that this whole problem of debt reaches far beneath the ordinary discussions, far beneath the familiar symptoms of booms and depressions, and even beneath such supposedly rock-bottom questions as money standards and currencies. I am going to speak of debt and the whole principle of borrowed money in every form except commercial bank-discount operations as the arch-foe of that very principle of private ownership of capital goods upon which, this side of Russia, the economic life of the world is supposed to rest.

Long-term money borrowing and speculative money borrowing are so interwoven with our ideas of the present capitalist system that it is almost like charging full tilt at a sacred cow to mention the fact that capitalism of this sort has nothing whatever to do with that fundamental capitalism which we understand as the right of private ownership of capital goods. Most discussions overlook the fact that the present system is a dual one. It does clamor loudly for the sanctity of private ownership of goods. But it mixes with that very sane and stimulating ideal a principle of quite another color, namely the capitalism of money lending as utterly divorced from ownership of goods. The stockholders of a railroad "own" the road. The bondholders do not own the road. They merely own the right to demand from the owners of the road the repayment of a certain sum of money at a specified date. They own a call on money, that is, on the medium of exchange, but they are not in the least sense partners in the business of railroading. Their claim on a payment of money has nothing whatsoever in common with ownership of capital goods. They have neither the rights nor the responsibilities of ownership. They are not even absentee property owners. They are not property

owners at all. They merely own the debtor obligations of other men, expressed in terms of legal-tender money.

Now there is no need to quarrel with the principle of money lending, itself, nor even with the principle of money lending at interest. The problem of usury and the problem of money lending at interest are two very different matters. As far back as 1515, Pope Leo X declared that usury was "the attempt to draw profit and increment, without labor, without cost, and without risk, out of the use of a thing *that does not fructify*." (Italics mine.) There is obviously a demand for, and a market value to, money that can be put to use to develop property, to open up mines or great territories, or to facilitate transfer and exchange of goods. Under such conditions, money "fructifies" indirectly, so that the question of usury in asking interest does not enter into the problem at all. Moreover, there is hardly any form of money lending through investment that does not involve at least a modicum of risk. Even if we eliminated risk, there are still, under our active and complex business system, so many indirectly productive uses to which money can be put that there is a distinct cost (in the sense of other potential profits lost) in lending money to this or that enterprise. This distinction between money lending at interest and usury, properly understood, is very important at the outset if we are to get a clear perspective on the real objections to the long-term use of "other people's money" and to speculative loans.

The valid objections to the capitalism of money borrowing or lending (always excepting short-term commercial discount) can be very briefly stated. First, in times of rising prices, it debauches the true values of ownership, incites to speculation and exaggerated profits, and leads to fatal over-expansion and excessive production. Secondly, in times of falling prices, it wipes out ownership right and left, or creates a vast transfer of ownership from former owners and borrowers to former creditors. In both cases, the effect of borrowed money has come to be called "leverage." As long as we have long-term and speculative borrowing, we shall have the "leverage" towards excess speculative profits in rising price cycles, and the "leverage" toward extreme losses in times of falling prices. Moreover, the very existence of this "leverage" exaggerates both the upward and downward movement of prices themselves.

Suppose we take a good honest look, first, at the "leverage" toward profits, and test the result by the brutal question "Is this good for the principle of ownership?" Some unusual factor, let us say, such as a war or a persistent crop shortage, brings us into a period of rising wheat prices. The farmer buys \$1,000 worth of wheat land at the current price. After selling his first crop, he finds that, after paying expenses, he has an operating profit of \$100 on the crop. He then figures out that if he had \$2,000 worth of land, he could make twice as large a gross operating profit. He borrows \$1,000, purchases as much acreage again as he first held, and agrees to pay six per-cent interest, or \$60 a year, for the use of the borrowed money. The double crop yields him a gross operat-

ing profit of \$200, from which he must deduct \$60 interest charges, leaving a net profit of \$140. He is just \$40 better off than in his first crop operation—thanks to "other people's money."

In the meantime, the price of wheat has risen considerably. The farmer figures that his next crop will yield a gross operating profit of \$300—with still only \$60 in interest to deduct. This tempts him to negotiate a still further loan of \$1,000, with which we will assume (for the sake of simplicity) he can still buy a third acreage equal to his first outright purchase. His next crop does yield a gross operating profit of \$150 for each third of the total acreage, or \$450 for the total. From this, he must deduct the interest on both loans at \$60 each, or \$120. Even after this deduction, he still has left \$330, or more than three times the profit received from his first crop. In the meantime, since he has used only \$1,000 of his own money in the entire operation, he is getting a return of thirty-three per cent on his original investment as against the ten per cent received from his first crop.

By this time, the land he owns has naturally risen in value as a result of the higher prices obtainable for the crops it will produce. A speculator offers him \$4,500 for his three tracts of land. He realizes that if he accepts the offer, he could pay off the \$2,000 he borrowed, pocket the difference of \$2,500, have, in addition to the higher income he has received from using borrowed money, a profit of \$1,500 in principal. This is a very alluring thought to him. He may have some tinge of regret at leaving the land he has worked on, at moving his family elsewhere, at "pulling up his roots." But his greed has been aroused. He hopes to repeat his successful operation somewhere else. His desire for more and more profits, and more and more income, becomes stronger than his desire to own and settle permanently on the land. In brief, his instinctive sense of ownership has been debauched. Instead of thinking of ownership as the accumulated fruits of labor, he thinks of it merely as a means to an end—more money. He finds that whereas he literally borrowed two-thirds of his land, he can pay back the debt in money representing considerably less than half the increased value of his land. He has discovered the magic of "leverage."

The details, but not the principles, differ in all other forms of long-term and speculative borrowing during rising-price periods. A company controlling a factory will make its first ventures with true partnership funds. Then, as profits loom large and prices of the manufactured products rise, borrowed money is added to partnership funds. The amount of the debt, in dollars, remains fixed, while the profits on the use of the money increase. The value of the plant (determined by its increased earning power) also rises. The debt, figured always in dollars, becomes smaller and smaller in relation to profits and to the rising value of the business. Eventually the debt, which once represented perhaps half of the value of the business, is discharged at the equivalent of one quarter of the value of the "going concern." Leverage has worked its magic again. But greed has been incited. The

owners seek further and further fields for expansion, and more and more profits. It is only a tragic incidental that, in expanding indefinitely, spurred on by the witchery of leverage, the owners begin to produce more goods than the public needs or can afford to buy. It is at this point that "leverage" gets ready for its mighty revenge.

Next week's article will discuss the reverse pressure which borrowed money produces at times of falling prices.

Education

A Finance Plan for Parish Schools

FRANCIS M. CROWLEY, PH.D.

Dean, School of Education, St. Louis University

WHILE the recent closing of the Catholic schools of the Archdiocese of Winnipeg gave 10,000 Canadian Catholics an opportunity to display their devotion to Catholic education during a financial crisis, it is significant that in honoring their petition for the reopening of the elementary schools Archbishop Sinnott indicated that no diocesan subsidy would be provided. The mention of a diocesan subsidy in the dispatches shows that the scheme had been considered; that is, the creation of a fund for the purpose would not have been viewed as an innovation in providing school support.

Will a large number of our parish schools be forced to close if the depression continues? A categorical answer cannot be given, but there can be little doubt that our present system of haphazard support makes such a possibility a very real and ever-present danger. It is reasonably certain that during the past two years as many Catholic elementary schools have been turned over to public-school officials, or abandoned, in the United States, as are now included in the school system of the Archdiocese of Winnipeg. The practice of turning over parish schools to public-school boards, with all the consequent ramifications of secularization, was dealt with at length last week in an article entitled "Shall We Close Our Schools?" Is there any way of guaranteeing the permanency of our school system in times of financial stringency so as to remove temptations to compromise? Acceptance of the plan to be proposed will call for radical revision of our modes of thought; that is, in so far as they concern the collection and apportionment of funds intended for school use.

Our complacency has been shattered during the depression by the very evident breakdown of our system of financing parish schools, yet when we look into the future we can see that even in prosperous times it will be utterly impossible for us to care for the increasing demands made on Catholic schools unless we radically reorganize our system of collecting and disbursing school revenues. Higher standards in teacher training, pre-school education, extension of extra-curricular activities, direct or indirect taxation, adult education, etc., will make it increasingly difficult for the Church to match public-school expenditures. Ultimately we will be forced to resort to some sort of equalization program.

Our present system of support shifts the entire responsibility to the shoulders of the pastor. Incomes of parishes vary a great deal, those in high-rent districts enjoying revenues which run into six figures, while others, in low-rent districts, carry on with incomes which may be measured in four or five figures. Parishes in low-rent districts, however, invariably have larger schools, with parallel obligations of greater expenditures for teachers' salaries, buildings, upkeep, etc. Such an uneven distribution of liabilities and resources is manifestly unjust. Again, though we have set for ourselves the high ideal of a tuition-free parish school, the free school is seldom found. This condition exists despite the pronouncements of various Church councils, the sanction of diocesan statutes, and constant insistence on the advisability and justice of such a plan by members of the Hierarchy. Thus tuition, even though nominal, must be paid, and, for a man in average circumstances with more than three children in a parish school at the same time, such a tax constitutes a distinct hardship. It is true that pastors do not insist on the payment of tuition, yet the exodus from Catholic schools during the depression has been a source of concern to Catholic educators. Parents are extremely sensitive and do not like to be placed on the poor list, so the children are transferred to the public school. The underlying causes for such abnormal conditions can be remedied only by diocesan action.

The futility of trying to win support for any proposal which would encroach on parochial prerogatives must have been evident to all who followed the spirited discussion, roused by the series of articles proposing diocesan control of parish schools, which appeared in this Review some ten years ago, and again in 1928 and 1929. Opponents claimed that diocesan elementary schools, or central control, would destroy parish loyalty, make it impossible for the pastor to keep in touch with his flock, weaken the enthusiasm of the pastor for Catholic education, run counter to the decrees of Church councils, etc. Objections of this character are made in good faith, but only too often experience proves them to be untenable.

We are dealing with a condition and not a theory: yet some authorities will not entertain the thought of diocesan control of parish schools. Granted, then, that there is little hope of establishing a system of central elementary schools, how are we to provide under parish auspices the high standard of instruction and stability guaranteed by the central Catholic elementary school? We should be able to reach our goal through some scheme of apportionment, devised for the purpose of giving financial aid to poorer parishes unable to provide the type of school demanded by State regulations and Church decrees.

The inference is that Catholics must recognize a broad and general responsibility for the education of all the children of the Church, rather than for groups of them here and there. The equitable distribution of revenues which this implies would be determined by costs, needs, inequalities, and local efforts. A fund should be established for equalization purposes; that is, to provide aid for poorer parishes or for schools experiencing temporary

financial difficulties. Repayments for the purpose of creating a revolving fund might be obligatory or optional, depending on the normal revenues of the parishes applying for aid.

Central control of all school revenues and expenditures is not proposed. The Archdiocese of Baltimore provided for such equalization some years ago through collections by the Little Flower Guild in the parishes of the cities of Baltimore and Washington, for the support of mission schools in Southern Maryland. The same principle was manifestly inherent in the \$9,000,000 campaign of the Diocese of Pittsburgh some years ago; Bishop Boyle indicating during the campaign that there would be provisions for equalization in allotting campaign contributions, in that the one-room school in the country district would be the first concern of the diocese. The principle of equalization of educational opportunity has been stressed constantly in drives for funds for central Catholic high schools, in the annual collection of the Diocese of Brooklyn for central Catholic high schools, and in the yearly collection for the Catholic University of America. These collections connote a definite commitment to the policy of equalization, and their continuance supports the belief that they have been found eminently practical.

Some dioceses now have the commendable practice of levying an assessment to secure funds for the support of the office of diocesan superintendent of schools, and in a few years a similar assessment will undoubtedly be levied for the support of diocesan teachers' colleges, and other educational work of a diocesan character. A tax of from two to four per cent, graduated according to the ordinary income of a parish, as is now done for the cathedralium, would provide for many of these essential activities and yet insure the surplus necessary for an equalization program.

There will be objections to the effect that it constitutes encroachment in another form, that it sets a premium on indolence and inefficiency, that it makes the pastor a collector of taxes, etc. Here, again, we are facing a condition, not a theory: the present method of supporting parish schools is inefficient and has broken down miserably during the present depression. The typical diocese has about seventy-five parish schools, and it may be taken for granted that the average annual income, taking into account high-rent and low-rent districts, is at least \$30,000. The diocesan tax for equalization of educational opportunity would yield from \$90,000 to \$100,000 annually. Experience dictates the wisdom of resorting to a special collection throughout the diocese on the same Sunday, since this provides a golden opportunity for impressing Catholics generally with the seriousness and peculiar character of the whole problem of parish-school support. A reasonable proportion should be held in reserve for emergencies; the remainder might be expended for betterment of school conditions throughout the diocese; the worth of applicants for aid, or the recommendations for subventions made by the diocesan superintendent to be passed on by the school board of the diocese. Even the most determined opponent of centralization would

be willing to admit the justice and feasibility of the scheme; and though we have consistently opposed State centralization of control in education, for the sake of our own program we should be opportunists of the first order. Complete diocesan control of education, from the kindergarten to the end of the secondary school period, will be an established fact within a generation. The demands of State and regional agencies leave us no room for choice: it is a case of unite, or accept the consequences of particularism.

There is a pressing need for equalization of Catholic educational opportunities, and sound economic, social, and religious reasons can be adduced for the indorsement of the plan suggested. It may sound visionary, yet it is nothing more than the adoption in the field of education of principles long in force in other fields of Catholic effort. Diocesan high schools have demonstrated the feasibility of the plan, yet we must bear in mind that the whole problem of diocesan high-school support was so relatively new, and extra-parochial in character, that there was little possibility of running foul of deep-rooted customs, or of having new departures viewed with disfavor. We might expect an equalization of Catholic educational opportunity tax to provide (1) greater stability in times of financial stringency, (2) Catholic educational opportunities for all, (3) means of systematizing, coordinating, and unifying educational programs, (4) ways of making all Catholics realize the seriousness of school financial problems, (5) free Catholic education on the elementary level, (6) equitable salaries for Religious, (7) better facilities for teacher training, and (8) resources for effectively coping with the insidious evil of secularism, which is growing in extent because of compromises dictated by expediency, or necessitated by economic pressure.

With Scrip and Staff

SOMETIMES I sit and wonder what progress is, anyhow. Are we going backward when we are going forward, or are we just going forward when we go backward? You see, you are never quite sure.

Not so long ago, for instance, various Columbia professors returned from Soviet Russia, enthusiastic over the style of education that they found there. The children were being educated according to the "natural method"; instead of fixed lessons they had projects; the traditional three R's were relegated to the rear; and discipline was achieved by autonomous councils of the children themselves. It was all so interesting, so creative, so ahead of our Western traditionalism.

Then comes out our National Education Association, and through the length and breadth of the nation makes its fervent plea not to abandon the so-called "frills." Nothing but a false idea of economy, they declare, would make us hark back to the regime of the three R's. Modern education has turned the corner forever, and the "frills" are with us to stay.

Now comes the news from Russia that, of a sudden, the Soviet educational authorities have turned their backs upon the "frills." Project work, social experimentation, and such like are to take the back seat. The three R's are decreed to be supremely necessary. Every young Bolshevik must know how to read, write, and cipher, before he attempts to mould capitalists in plaster, or to give lectures to the peasants on seed conservation. Moreover, discipline is to be restored. The teacher is no longer to look to the pupils' council for authority. His or her commands shall no longer be flouted. He represents the sovereign majesty of the State. When he says "Shut the window!" the window is to be shut. Presumably, he can inflict penalties. In short, authority, that hated word, detested of all exponents of creative psychic development, is to be restored to the schoolroom.

HEARING this rather startling bit of news, and wondering what its effect would be upon the staunch defenders of lavish State appropriations for non-essentials, I was better prepared for what my old friend Dr. Kirkland had to tell me, at his recent visit to my hermitage. Dr. Kirkland is principal of an excellent school for Catholic boys. The school prides itself upon its home spirit; and there really is plenty of it.

"We have abolished," said Dr. Kirkland, out of the blue, "all punishments in our school, save one." Naturally my curiosity was aroused, while my heart sank, wondering if this veteran educator had gone Dewey. To my feeble inquiry, as to what that one remaining sanction on scholastic discipline might be, the Doctor replied promptly: "Corporal punishment. We have done away with everything else. No more detention after school hours; no more 'jug'; no more lines to write or lines to learn; no more suspensions, demerits, and such like. For all offenses, for all the boys, just one penalty: a caning."

"What, then, are the results?" I asked.

"Nothing but satisfactory. The boys themselves are satisfied with the arrangement. It has cleared the air. The punishment is painful; they get some sharp raps. But when it is over, it is over. And it leaves behind no aftermath of hard feelings. We shake hands, make up, and that is the end of the business.

"The penalty is inflicted immediately, as soon as the fault is known. No delays, no hang-overs. And the penalty is precisely graduated to the offense."

"How do the parents of the boys take it?"

"There was a great uproar at the beginning," said the Doctor. "Some boys were withdrawn. But most of those even who made an outcry now endorse our plan."

Lest the Pilgrim appear as an indiscriminate advocate of the switch and the cane, let me add a few provisos to the Doctor's account. First, there is, to my knowledge, no law against corporal punishment in the State in which his school is situated. Many of our States forbid it absolutely. Again, the boys who frequent his school are from well-to-do families, accustomed to plenty of freedom and privileges; which, too, are generously accorded at the school. If they do not like this particular feature, there

are ample opportunities for obtaining an education elsewhere. Finally, the actual punishment is administered by laymen, already experienced in school discipline; and with an entire safeguarding of justice and fair play. Dr. Cowles, of Soul Clinic fame, believes that our present school system lets too many incipient psychopathic or neurotic children get through unnoticed. Perhaps there would be fewer such if there were more discipline.

DO we talk too much about education? Perhaps we do. But it is a great thing to die and feel that you have helped in the education of even one worthy person.

That, at least, was Miss Catherine Tinney's idea. This good lady lived to the age of 105, and died on January 27 in Philadelphia. After thinking things over for a century or so, she came to the conclusion that the greatest achievement she could hope for in life would be to help educate some worthy boys for the priesthood. She was no professor of theology, so she could not apply for a position in the Seminary. Nor had she any fortune, so she could not endow the world with a Catherine Tinney Fund, in the style of a Laura Spelman Rockefeller. But she had a neat little house at 6023 McCallum Street, Germantown, which, as you know, is really Philadelphia, only possibly a little more so. It consists of Germantown Avenue, a litany of side streets, and trimmings, which include marble front steps and an array of apple blossoms in the spring. So she left the house, front steps and all, for the education of "a worthy aspirant for the priesthood"; one at a time, I presume. Miss Tinney, some great mementos will be wafted from future altars to your soul in the beyond.

TIME and tide bring many strange things to pass, educationally and otherwise. Recently it brought together, at Loyola University in New Orleans, the two brothers Maring, S.J., who had seen each other only three times, and then but for a brief moment, in twenty-six years. Though both members of the same Jesuit Province, their paths remained always separated, until now that Father Joseph Maring is professor of Latin and German at Loyola, and Father Karl Maring is professor of physics.

Thirteen members of the family of the two brothers have become Jesuits and one a nun. Brother Ignatius Boehmeke, who was stationed for forty years at the Church of the Immaculate Conception on Baronne Street, in New Orleans, was a great grand-uncle of the Marings.

Time and tide, too, brought the other day Lady Mountbatten, who, as a lady explorer, had scared the wits out of the Persian Government, to the famous old hospital of Saint Sauveur, in Paris. Doctor Gosset, the great Paris physician, would have her cared for by none but the Sisters, in their equally famous clinic of Saint Sauveur. To no other hospital, either, would Tiger Clemenceau be taken, when shot and wounded in the streets of Paris. The eater of Religious, when on his feet, was the client of the Religious, when on the flat of his back. And so another of life's ironies.

THE PILGRIM.

Back of Business

THE first week of the emergency session of Congress witnessed the passing of President Roosevelt's recommendations on banking, the budget, and beer. Though none of these measures is responsible for the depression, though their enactment does not drive away the depression, though none of them can be considered key problems, their importance cannot be overestimated; for they contain the vital element of action, of leadership, and, through the response of the public, confidence.

The next weeks in Congress will disclose more fundamental reforms, though they may be less spectacular. They are real key problems and, in dealing with them, Congress will show its true mettle. I am referring to the problems of agriculture, of unemployment, and of indebtedness. It should not be assumed that the Government can finally and definitely settle these problems. They are far too intricate for that.

Take, as an instance, the farmer's dilemma. In the last analysis his plight is due to the fact that he closed his doors to progress. He is still producing for the human stomach, whereas the people have turned their minds from food to comfort and luxury as more pleasing objects for a drain on the pocketbook. The farmer has not industrialized his enterprise—and the Government, by subsidies, tariffs, rates, prices, and numerous other concessions, has helped him to continue his century-old practices in a new world.

The best that can be expected from the Government, then, is emergency relief for the farmers, the jobless, and the debtors. It will be attempted to raise prices by cutting production of wheat, cotton, corn, etc. To assure success, negotiations must be started abroad where there are not only some of the principal markets, but all of the principal competitors.

The unemployed will probably be helped partly through public works, and partly through unemployment insurance. The first expenditure in public works will run to half a billion dollars, which wipes out the anticipated savings in veterans' pensions and administration reorganization. Unemployment insurance, in turn, can neither be supported by the Government nor by labor, but only by the employers, which is equivalent to taxation. They are evil effects, but they are the smaller evils.

As to domestic debts, there is, in my belief, only one way out: to cut interest as well as principal. Government debts will be reduced by way of conversion into long-term obligations. Corporation debts have been substantially cut through the writing-off process and through voluntary or compulsory liquidation. Railroad debts will likely be reduced through readjustment of fixed charges. And farmers' and individual debts will be curtailed if the bankruptcy law passes.

The next few months will be trying. And they will bring us only emergency relief. But as long as we act, we make progress.

GERHARD HIRSCHFELD.

Literature

To Janice and Several Young Novelists

CAMILLE MCCOLE

THERE are so many things to do in Paris! Wednesday I walked the twenty miles of corridors in the Louvre and saw the famous crown and the de Milo. Yesterday I climbed almost 400 steps up the winding stone tower of Notre Dame and looked across at the gray, drab walls of the Invalides, witness to so much silent suffering. I've seen the Pantheon, meditated in La Trinité, kicked (just a bit) at the gravel walks in the Tuileries, swaggered my stick on the Champs Elysées, had my *café au lait* and *brioche* at the Café de la Paix, seen the riotously rich student life of Montparnasse late at night and, what was better, watched the soft sunlight that glowed over Sacré Coeur in the early morning.

And now I have your letter! I am afraid, Janice, that I would ordinarily be annoyed with such a letter—some-what as I used to be when you told me you were reading James Branch Cabell. But there is a mellow sort of comfort about "Chez Charlot's" here that makes it hard for anyone to be annoyed just now with anything. Indeed, the twinkling eyes of Monsieur Rocard over there in the corner are evidence enough of this comfort and humor. He has been talking there for hours and I suspect that he might even sleep here on one of these hard wood benches that only his own elegant garrulity can make even tolerable. I wonder what Paris would be like without "Chez Charlot's" and I know that Monsieur Charlot himself must tremble when he pauses to contemplate what his own amiable establishment would be like without Monsieur Rocard, this kindly guest who is so often at his board. *Je suis épuisé; je ne peux pas voir ce verre!* groans Monsieur Rocard. But he does not stop talking.—And I must answer your letter.

You tell me, Janice, that you are tired of reading so many modern novels. So am I. But for a different reason. You find fault with what you call the mustiness in so many of the characters in these novels. You ask for books in which the characters are young and have more of what you designate as the "enthusiasm of youth." I find fault with too many of our novelists because they show too much of this enthusiasm of youth. After one has read so many novels dealing with the intellectual and, alas, moral emancipation and frenetic activity of the young, it is refreshing for me to find an occasional one in which some grand old man or woman walks a small spot of the earth, a little stooped perhaps, but with head erect and clear eyes looking back upon a saner day.

I wonder if you remember old Lady Slane in Lady Sackville-West's "All Passion Spent." I asked you to read that book, you will recall, and if you did you will not have forgotten the sunny serenity with which Lady Slane lay back against death to examine life, surrounding herself with only those friends who, like herself, were nearer to death than to birth: Genoux, her old French maid; Mr. Bucktrout, that amiable old gentleman who

was always predicting the end of the world but who somehow or another didn't worry about it much. To Lady Slane, life was very much like a lake "offering its even surface to many reflections, gilded by the sun, silvered by the moon, darkened by a cloud, roughened by a ripple, but level always, a plane, keeping its bounds."

It seems to me that what our American writers need to learn perhaps more than anything else is a way of suggesting that life does have a fairly level surface—instead of a surface with so many creatures (not exactly angels either) that are troubling its waters. We hear much today, Janice, about the dissatisfactions of life; we have dozens of novels which try to reduce this "poor shimmering cosmos" of ours to mere chemical and biological terms of denial or negation—and these proponents of the "youth" novel which you advocate are our worst offenders—but, it seems to me, that what we need is some highborn affirmation or satisfaction, some novelist who will stop trying to take life apart and who will, instead, try to put some of it together. The air all around old Lady Slane was "full of the sound of bees" and life to her was good and full and rich. But the atmosphere created by too many of our own novelists is full of the sound of hornets with ever vicious stings.

As I sit here this late afternoon in this, one of the older cities of the world—Mère Catherine's up the hill here, up on the Mount of Martyrs, has not missed serving a single meal for 135 years—as I sit here, it occurs to me that we need a few more old characters in our novels, and novels written by people who themselves act as if they were a little older. Miss Hannah Mole in Young's "Miss Mole," she who insisted that she was quite robust enough to affect any currents on the unknown ocean of her life and who clamored that it "isn't the days that are dull, it's the people who can't see them properly"; the militant old grandmother in "Jalna" who pounded essential loyalties into her aging sons, holding them with her glittering eyes so full of purpose, and emphasizing her commands with the thumping of her stick: where will you find in any of our novels of "youth"—in that grim parade of cock-tail parties that last into such long, sodden dawns—such courage and mellow poise and determination and charm?

Our novelists deal *too* much with youth, though their responsibilities toward that youth do not appear to rest very heavily upon their decadent shoulders. They themselves seem too young. And somehow or another they do not harmonize this work of theirs with that so helpful continuity of old age and tradition. I remember hunting once with one of our best known American poets. We were working our way through a forest of pines, some of them three hundred years old and so tall that where they pointed upwards they seemed to meet the sky that came down to meet them. My friend stopped, looked at one old majestic fellow, chuckled, and said, "Those trees could tell us a lot if they could talk. They could show us a lot. I wonder, for example, what they'd think of Dreiser and of Mencken." I wonder, too, what they'd think of that galaxy of disgruntled dullards—don't be

harsh with my impolite figure, Janice—who try to make us believe that life is a matter of discarding wedding rings and shattering illusions. They do not do that here in the Old World and both their literature and the gray, aging walls of all these buildings bear witness.

I have talked to you several times before about one of the rich and vital sources of a tradition much needed in America. I refer, of course, to our Faith, to the Catholic tradition which an ever encroaching number of non-Catholic writers are snatching away from us. When I think of the richly powerful study that Edwin Arlington Robinson did of Barabbas pleading for the soul of Nicodemus; when I think of the colorful and imaginative account of two thieves which Manuel Komroff has done in his novel; when I recall the cadenced wisdom of such poetry as is in "The Prophet," and such prose as that which has come from the pioneer studies of Elizabeth Madox Roberts, I wonder how long it is going to take to seize a little of this material ourselves.

To take but one example: you, yourself, live in the Fox River Valley in Wisconsin, a part of the State settled by missionaries over 300 years ago. How long is it going to be before someone captures in a novel the rich lonely spirit of that heroic man who paddled his canoe up those hungry waters that flow before your very door? There are dozens of other subjects awaiting such treatment and I can think most certainly of no other sounder tradition to deal with. Maybe some day we will have drowned out the raucous cries of our mad, complex metropolitanism with the subdued tones of a literature that deals with fundamentals. Reread "Maria Chapdelaine" and you will see what I mean.

But, like the day outside, my letter comes to an end. Dusk is falling on the streets and the people streaming by with a loaf of long bread under one arm remind me that Rue La Bruyère will soon be deserted for that period which every Frenchman sets aside before he dines. Monsieur Rocard is still talking, telling of his holiday at Deauville, how tired he is because he could find no bed at the crowded resort. Thousands of people on the beach and not a room in the town. Unbelievable!

It is unbelievable also that Monsieur can tell that story for three hours when he is so tired. But Monsieur Rocard does not think of that. He is your true philosopher and bagatelles sometimes assume a significance that would escape the rest of us prosaic individuals. And so I leave him for awhile now, Janice, and go out where amidst the gayeties of Paris I shall not be unmindful of the serene and sage traditions of an older world.

REVIEWS

Education and the Philosophy of Experimentalism. By JOHN L. CHILDS, PH.D. New York: The Century Company. \$2.00.

Dr. Kilpatrick in the foreword says this book is "the most inclusive and thoroughgoing single study of the philosophy of experimentalism published in this country since Dewey's 'Democracy and Education.'" One might admit this laudatory puff and yet disagree with experimentalism as a "philosophy" and as an educational technique. One of the surest symptoms of the madness of our times in this country to future generations will be

the breathless awe with which John Dewey has been placed in a niche as the American philosopher par excellence by his contemporaries. However, on the supposition that Dewey's "philosophy" needs clarification, Dr. Childs' book meets a genuine need. This much can be said: that where Dewey abounds in murky periods, the present work has the merit of simplicity, if not elegance, of style. Dr. Childs insists that the Dewey school of thought is best called the philosophy of experimentalism, that it has a "metaphysic" of its own. He tries to show that this experimentalism, sired of Pierce's and James' pragmatism (one wonders if Dewey himself would admit the ancestry) is the only indigenous American philosophy, a natural growth of certain factors on the American scene. This historical genesis of experimentalism is ably handled by Dr. Childs. Not so happy are the dull and wearying chapters devoted to the "metaphysic" of experimentalism, its concept of the nature of man. On the other hand, a clear statement of the Dewey school on the freedom of the will and behavioristic psychology is given in Chapters 6 and 7. All in all, Childs has given an adequate picture of what the Deweyites mean by experimentalism. That it is a philosophy at all many will deny; it might better be called a lay religion without a god and without a cult, its sole dogma, the Hegelian dogma of becoming and its utter denial of all fixed goals. If philosophy it be, it is a philosophy of despair. The danger of Dewey's "philosophy" is more apparent, I believe, in this book than in any one of Dewey. Many of the rank and file of American teachers, who have been indoctrinated with this philosophy in normal schools and teachers' colleges, fail to see the implications of Dewey's philosophy. It is absolutely destructive of all traditional Christianity.

W. J. McG.

Political India. Edited by SIR JOHN CUMMING. New York: Oxford University Press. \$1.35.

Gandhi Versus the Empire. By H. T. MUZUMDAR. New York: Universal Publishing Company. \$3.50.

Is it the combination of English realism and Indian idealism that keeps the world-at-large in doubt concerning the true state of affairs in India and makes it so difficult for the outsider to establish once and for all a true estimate of the India situation? In the vast array of books on India, the reader is drawn now one way, now another, depending on who the author is, and must, if he be fair, bear in mind that "there are many sides to every question." "Political India" is a compilation of papers written by men well recommended for their work by their long and intimate association with individuals and situations. The book deals with many topics of gravest moment in the Indian question, such as "The Evolution of Political Life in India," "The Indian National Congress," "Minority Communities," etc., and discusses some of the outstanding political leaders, including "Gandhi as a Factor in Indian Politics." It has to do more with events and conditions than with opinions, and is very informative. However, doubts concerning the accuracy of this information arise when the reader turns to "Gandhi Versus the Empire," a summary written by an author, "sometimes described as the unofficial ambassador of good-will from India to America." The author is an ardent admirer of Gandhi and a "strong supporter of the latter's principle of non-violent revolution." His ardor rolls up in nearly every page of the book and sometimes overflows into rather forceful invectives against those who have written against Gandhi and his methods, or against India in general. The comparisons between Gandhi and Jesus Christ can be easily understood by the patent ignorance of the Divinity of Christ, but to those readers who recognize and accept that Divinity, such comparisons are nothing short of blasphemous.

R. P. L.

Henry Adams. By JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS. New York: Albert and Charles Boni, Inc. \$2.50.

This is a biography of Henry Brooks Adams, who was born at Boston, Mass., in 1838 and died at Washington, D. C., in 1918. A Unitarian in his young manhood, he died probably a stoic.

A graduate of Harvard, he considered the time spent there as wasted, for of that institution he says: "It taught little, and that little ill," and it was his belief that its work of four years could easily have been accomplished in four months. As secretary to his father, Charles Francis Adams, then Minister to England, he gained eight years of experience as an amateur diplomat. It was during this period that he laid the foundation for his future career as a journalist. Returning to America, yielding to the persuasion of family and friends, he reluctantly accepted an appointment to a chair as professor of history at Harvard University. His reputation as an historian and a novelist here had its inception. He was a confirmed traveler, as familiar with Europe as with his own America, and a keen observer and tourist of the Asiatic orient. One closes this biography with a saddened heart, for despite the unusual opportunities for spiritual advancement, domestic, diplomatic, social, intimately companionate, that always attended Henry Brooks Adams, he died, and by his will saw to it that he should be buried beneath a monument that in his own words typified "not happiness." "No, it is beyond pain and beyond joy." That is the Adams Memorial, Rock Creek Cemetery, Washington, D. C. A bibliography cataloguing his writings as done year by year concludes this book; and an alphabetical index closes the work.

M. J. S.

Modern German Literature. By ARTHUR ELOESSER. Translated by CATHERINE ALISON PHILLIPS. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. \$3.50.

A number of prominent German authors have dealt with the problem of this book. Kurt Martens, W. Stammer, F. von der Leyen, W. Mahrholz, H. Naumann, and A. Soergel may be mentioned. Our translation, from a work originally published as "Die Deutsche Literatur von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart," must have been chosen in preference to the works of those scholars because it appeals to the reading public rather than to students of German literature. Dr. Eloesser, for years the dramatic critic of *Vossische Zeitung*, has been writing his essays and biographies with the objective of average readers in mind. The book, at times in a somewhat journalistic manner, chronicles and interprets the leading features of contemporary German literature. G. Hauptmann, to whom the German book has been dedicated, is treated with the conviction of a writer who took an intimate part in the development of ideas and thoughts which found expression in the later work of Hauptmann. In Hugo von Hofmannsthal, we find the early lyrical poetry stressed to the disadvantage of his prose work which seeks to proclaim the national message of poetic literature. Of Stefan George's role in German poetry and art we do not get any too favorable account. It was to be expected that the traditional sobriety of Berlin (Chapter XI) never would have launched upon the panegyrics of Father Wolters. It is a pity, however, that R. M. Rilke, whose symbolism is now being viewed in its religious perspectives, must rest content with an over-cautious statement almost censorious in effect. "Rilke was a belated survivor of that Romantic individualism which is forever taken up with itself, and it is a question whether poets of his type, who sum up in themselves the whole cultural tradition of Europe as well as of their own time, can possibly continue to exist in the future" (p. 333). Even Ludwig Lewisohn, who confesses to be on most points in admiring agreement with Dr. Eloesser, takes exception to this statement. He tells the American readers that "Dr. Eloesser's words on Rilke cannot be the final ones." More fortunate is Eloesser's treatment of Thomas Mann, Jakob Wassermann, and Franz Werfel. The chapter "Before and Since the War" belongs to the very best portion of this book, particularly through its instructive report on S. Freud. The method of literary history and criticism employed in this work tries to combine the biographical, ethnological, and philosophical ways of approach. We are not so sure as to Eloesser's philosophy. At least the epilogue gives no evidence that the author would prove to be a dependable guide. For one who seeks general information about the literary and social trends of modern Germany

this book may be recommended. The translation by Catherine Alison Phillips gives the impression of conscientious and intelligent work; but we are not convinced that all titles and technical terms are conclusively rendered.

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Biographical.—Mona Wilson's "Queen Elizabeth" (Appleton, \$2.00) is a compact and readable biography, written in sound English, from an evident wealth of detailed study. There is a little, but only a little, Protestant bias in the work; or perhaps, only a tendency to accept the London attitude toward Elizabeth as that of all England. Elizabeth's personal peculiarities are handled with an excellent combination of candor and decent reticence.

John Terence McGovern is a fine man, an admirable, likable man. He has written a book, "Diogenes Discovers Us" (Dial, \$3.00). The book contains two things. First, it is a collection of fourteen short biographical sketches, averaging less than twenty pages each. The biographed are mostly athletes and sportsmen, although there are three nice ladies included. But the real theme of the book, stringing the biographies together, is a fable of Diogenes and Pan revisiting the earth today and concluding from the evidence of the biographies that we are all fine fellows. The book inevitably recalls that finest of Daniel Webster's speeches, the gist of which was this: "Men of Rochester, go on! No people ever lost its liberty, that had a waterfall one hundred and thirty-five feet high!"

Poor Marie Antoinette has been guillotined again. Katharine Anthony's "Marie Antoinette" (Knopf, \$3.00) is a singularly inept piece of work the clue to which may possibly be given in a sentence of Miss Anthony's own: "Gossip is the favorite occupation of spinsterish minds." The book is crowded with intimate details, which are often interpreted with a distortion vinegarishly malevolent; in other words, the writer displays a sharp feminine hostility toward most of the people she writes about. It is true she has some sympathy for Marie Antoinette herself of a patronizing sort; she even endows her, on the slenderest of evidence, with the modern virtue of unchastity; and she romanticizes over Fersen, whom she calls, in spite of his portrait given in the book, "the beautiful Axel Fersen." But she rather claws most everyone else. Even the grave does not protect them. Henri Quatre is dragged from his, 180 years after his death, to have his becoming a Catholic made the cause of the French Revolution.

Properly enough a biography of "Josh Billings, Yankee Humorist" (International Mark Twain Society, Webster Groves, Mo. \$2.00) is the work of Cyril Clemens, a relative of Mark Twain, and is dedicated to Stephen Leacock. Rupert Hughes writes the introduction. This is a very scholarly and serious study of the art and career of Henry Wheeler Shaw, whose Josh Billings, like the later Mr. Dooley, is an American classic. An extensive bibliography and an index complete its value for the student.

Literature.—Bohemian aspects of Parisian life and personal reminiscences feature the pages of Maurice Sachs' "The Decade of Illusion, Paris 1918-1928" (Knopf, \$3.50). The book itself is a veritable "Who's Who" of the Parisian intelligentsia during the memorable days of illusion. The names of Picasso, Cocteau, Chanel, Maurois, Claudel, and others appear frequently throughout the pages of this gossipy resume of contemporary French culture. M. Sachs' estimate of Paul Claudel, statesman and poet, is noteworthy. Therein he remarks on Claudel's "solidity" of mind and deep Christian fervor. He compares him to "a block of that French stone which, grave and indulgent, sees the ages vanish and form again." The author's intimate knowledge of the personalities who are forming the course of contemporary French literature and art bespeaks an acutely observant mind and good reportorial ability.

"To Think of Tea!" (Houghton Mifflin, \$2.75), by Agnes Repplier, is a very interesting social discussion of that for which

England has been noted for years. Miss Repplier gives with historical background the story of tea from its coming to England to the drinking of tea today. One of America's most distinguished essayists has given in this book novel descriptions of famous English men and women as they enjoyed themselves about their firesides—firesides that were the centers of important events. In one chapter the author shows in contrast the part played in American history by this "blameless and beneficent herb."

Once again the "brightest ornament" of his century, Dr. Samuel Johnson, comes to light via the medium of an altogether readable work entitled, "A Johnson Handbook" (Crofts, \$2.00), by Mildred C. Struble, Professor of Comparative Literature in the University of California. The author sets out to offer, as compactly as is feasible, a compendium of the salient data concerning the life, the character, and the principal works of this most volatile personality. These objectives are attained, and the result is a work, short yet comprehensive, covering the varied aspects of Dr. Johnson's genius with due regard for his abilities as conversationalist, essayist, lexicographer, novelist, critic, and poet.

An excellent companion to Milton studies is found in "A Milton Handbook" (Crofts, \$2.00), by James H. Handford, inasmuch as it gives a finer appreciation of Milton's genius, and effects in one a warmer sympathy towards him; in this is the handbook a real companion to the appreciation of Milton's spirit. This is the result even of the somewhat uninteresting chapter on the prose works. The chapters "Style and Versification" and "Fame and Influence" are really worthwhile. The book's arrangement is in every respect helpful to profitable study; in particular, the expanded bibliography is a valuable addition.

"Imaginations and Reveries" (Macmillan, \$2.75), by A. E., is the reissue of a volume of essays, pen pictures, and a three-act play, "Deirdre," which were first published in 1915. This volume contains two additional pieces on more up to date affairs. It is a strangely assorted collection, and in this lies its principal value and interest, for it brings the reader from the opening of the "Irish Renaissance" movement in the 'nineties to the change of spirit during the War. Moreover, it offers material for the study of a rather interesting character, A. E., a man of contrasts and contradictions. His teachings is all of "earth and air and water and sky," of back to the land, and of fresh beginnings, yet his style is often as luxuriant and obscure as Pater's, and as cloying as the Decadents'. His talk of "Back to Aphrodite and the pagan past," in itself a rather contradictory presentation, is certainly not suggestive of Ireland. Yet this man can speak in a clear-cut, sensible way on agricultural problems and, though professing himself "Anglo-Irish," can utter a chivalrous and telling rebuke to one who casts a slur upon the Irish Republicans.

Catholic Work Books.—Benziger Brothers have prepared a very thorough and attractive "Work Book in Church History" (68 cents), with a key for teachers, by the Rev. Edmund J. Goebel, to accompany the text of the Rev. John Laux.—William H. Sadlier, in "Outline Lessons on the Missal and the Mass" by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F. Glavin, supplies the schools with one of the most valuable and up-to-the-minute studies of that great mystery of Catholic liturgy which is so much the center of Catholic thought and action today.

Hagiographical.—Much reading, not only of Biblical literature but of the Fathers, of Josephus, and divers saints and theologians, was necessary before Jean Ravenne's "Mary of Jerusalem" (Longmans, \$2.50) could be written; and a thorough knowledge of the topography of the Holy Land besides a good historical imagination were also required. The book is an account of the life of the Blessed Virgin told in the form of a novel, but this somewhat daring fictional experiment has been carried out with reverence and with the intention of augmenting love for Mary in her children's hearts. Of particular interest are the chapters dwelling on the Blessed Virgin's early years as a child in the Temple,

those concerning the flight and sojourn in Egypt, and the last, covering the period after the Ascension, when Christ's Mother was the inspiration and nurse of the infant Church. The book is capably translated and adapted by Katherine A. Hennessy.

"Gemma of Lucca" (Herder. \$1.25), by Benedict Williamson, is an attractively written life of the Italian girl mystic, devotee of the Passion, who died in 1903 and whose fame has since spread all over the world. It discloses the character, virtues and trials of this servant of God, giving copious extracts from her letters; and includes accounts of many miracles attributed to her intercession. There are four illustrations.

Atlases and Guides.—Now that school children are becoming internationally minded, all forms of geography are taking on a new phase. Rand, McNally and Company has prepared for American schools and colleges a revised and enlarged edition of "Goode's School Atlas" (\$4.00). Dr. J. Paul Goode has spared no pains in bringing every type of information in any way connected with geography graphically before the mind. His use of the various forms of map projections and the careful use of graphs and color schemes make the book a treasury of present-day information in regard to each country, its location, atmosphere, products, deposits, etc. It can be strongly recommended for schools and home.

Henry Holt and Company, in publishing the "Atlas of Medieval and Modern History" (\$3.00), by William R. Shepherd, has done a valuable service for the student historian. While not replacing the "Historical Atlas," it contains in its eighty maps all the information that a student usually requires. While the book is handily bound for convenience, many of the maps are so large that they cover double pages. Countries are marked off distinctly and color schemes indicate the position and power of various nations at succeeding periods. It is a valuable and very compact *vade mecum* for the student of history.

C. S. Hammond and Company has prepared a small and convenient volume for the young student in their "Hammond's Handy Atlas of the World" (\$1.00). The maps are very distinct and well marked. Much information is given in a Gazetteer-Index of the World. The first part of the atlas covers all parts of the world and the second is devoted to accurate presentation of each State of the Union.

The Macmillan Company are distributors of the excellent "Blue Guide" (12s 6d). The latest edition for Ireland, edited by Findlay Muirhead, meets all the standards of this excellent library so valued by travelers abroad. Nearly every town and village in the whole of Ireland is represented, with accurate information about its location, methods of reaching it, and splendid bits of history and folklore. The maps are excellent, and, considering the convenient pocket size of the book, very distinct. There is an ample index.

Books Received.—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

AMERICAN AND CANADIAN HOSPITALS. Edited by James Clark Fifield. Midwest Publishers.
BIG CAGE, THE. Clyde Beatty with Edward Anthony. \$3.50. Century.
CAN BUSINESS BUILD A GREAT AGE? William Kix Miller. Macmillan.
CHRIST IN THE BREADLINE. Kenneth W. Porter, Seymour Gorden Link, and Harry Elmore Hurd. 50 cents. Driftwind Press.
HISTORY OF THE ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS OF MODERN EUROPE. A. Frederick L. Nussbaum. \$3.25. Crofts.
HOOVER DAM. Compiled by William H. Gates. \$2.00. Hoover Dam Scenic Corporation.
KING OF ROME, THE. R. McNair Wilson. \$2.00. Appleton.
LADIES' ROAD, THE. Pamela Hinkson. \$2.50. Longmans, Green.
LITTLE SAINT ELIZABETH. Elisabeth von Schmidt Pauli. \$1.00. Macmillan.
LITTLE SAINT THERÈSE. Elisabeth von Schmidt Pauli. \$1.00. Macmillan.
LONELY MAN, THE. Gilbert Frankau. \$2.50. Dutton.
MARIE ANTOINETTE. Stefan Zweig. \$3.50. Viking.
MEMORANDA PRESENTED TO THE LYTTON COMMISSION, VOLUME III. V. K. Wellington Koo. \$1.00. Chinese Cultural Society.
MINUTE STORIES OF THE OPERA. Paul Grabbe and Paul Nordoff. \$1.00. Grosset and Dunlap.
NEW ROAD. Merle Colby. \$2.50. Viking.
ODYSSEY OF CABREZA DE VACA, THE. Morris Bishop. \$3.00. Century.
PIONEER GERMAN CATHOLICS IN THE AMERICAN COLONIES; THE LEOPOLDINE FOUNDATION AND THE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. Rev. Lambert Schrott, O.S.B.; Rev. Theodore Roemer, O.M.Cap. U. S. Catholic Historical Society.
POINTS EAST. Rachel Field. \$2.00. Macmillan.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

The Unemployment-Insurance Plan

To the Editor of AMERICA:

One is not made happy to see Gerhard Hirschfeld call unemployment insurance a fallacy, as he did in AMERICA for February 25.

Today unemployment insurance represents a very definite movement in America. This movement has for its purpose a more equitable distribution of wealth in this country. The average American is cognizant of big corporations having set aside hundreds of millions of dollars each year in order that they might have that much more wealth. Now this has been done in the face of paying labor a non-living wage and laying them off during various periods of the year without any pay. The movement of unemployment insurance would simply operate to earmark a certain amount of those hundreds of millions of dollars for the purpose of labor when it is not employed. If it is good business to set aside wealth during prosperous times that you may be able to pay dividends during dull times, is it also not good business—aside from the morality of the thing—to set aside a sum that labor may have purchasing power during the time labor is not employed?

Reliable statistics can be obtained to show that since 1925 dividend payments have increased twenty per cent, whereas payrolls have diminished fifty per cent. This is an alarming matter. The movement called unemployment insurance would increase payrolls and decrease stock dividends thereby striking some sort of an equitable balance between the two, so necessary.

The above-named concludes his column by saying that we might as well drop the unemployment-insurance plan and tax the rich outright. Why get all excited and fetch in the fetish of any class struggle? It isn't a case of soaking the rich; it is simply a question of a moral and just division of the return a certain business enjoys.

If this movement suffers a misnomer, certainly no good purpose is served by becoming doctrinaire in the use of the language respecting it. Call it what you will, it surely does not lie in the mouth of anyone to say that the movement identified as unemployment insurance is a fallacy.

Winona, Minn.

THOMAS E. WILEY, JR.

Assisting at Mass

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In regard to your editorial, "Do You Say Mass," may we not judge of the value of a work of piety by the indulgence the Church grants for said work? Yes?

Well, then, for saying the Rosary before the Blessed Sacrament the Church grants a plenary indulgence. For assisting at Mass only a partial indulgence. Why should I not, then, while assisting at Mass, say the sorrowful Rosary, and so both assist at Mass and gain a plenary indulgence? You see, most laymen have not unlimited time for devotions. And we would like to help the poor souls with indulgences. I do not see why the Rosary will not serve very well up to the Consecration, especially the sorrowful mysteries, and then prayers which unite us to the proper spirit of the Sacrifice.

Santa Barbara.

ADRIAN F. BURKARD, M.D.

[The glory given to God, not the attached indulgence, is the proper standard for judging "the value of a work of piety." Our correspondent would be closer to the mind of the Church and would help the poor souls more if he subordinated his devotions, admirable as they are, to the Liturgy, and if he assisted at Mass, not as he thinks best, but as the Church thinks best.—Ed. AMERICA.]

1933

500
ressed
com-

employ-
ry 25.
move-
more
erage
hun-
might
n the
dur-
move-
ear-
ollars
good
may
good
sum
or is

divi-
rolls
The
rolls
f an

we
the
h of
mply
rtain

pur-
uage
the
ploy-

R.

not
the

ment
Mass
sting
Mass
not
poor
not
wful
it of

D.

pper
cor-
ould
dmi-
not
CA.]